Published on the 15th of the month

Vol. XXIX. No. 2 MAY, 1939

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
Before the Killing Begins	57
Lord Elton and Canon Streeter	60
A Layman's Criticism and Appeal	62
Astrologers in Conference	65
Behind the Scenes	68
Notes on the Life of a Modernist Hubert Handley.	70
The Clue to History Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr	75
The Spirit-Bearing Church The Editor.	82
The Teacher's Task R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.	86
Book Reviews:	
Religious Congresses	91
The Birth Pangs of the Kingdom	97
The History of the Episcopal Church in Japan	100
The Truth of the Bible	101
Pastor in Parochia	103
The Philosophy of Professor Stocks	105
The Bible in Schools	106
The Last of the Anglo-Saxon Saints	108
Correspondence Evangelism and the Film; Civilization and the Christian Metaphysic.	110

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 1s. net. Annual Subscription, 10/6

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L.& R.).

SPRINGHERNE

GUEST HOUSE

ROSS - ON - WYE

The house is set above an orchard and meadows, on a hill looking West over the Wye Valley towards the Welsh Hills, within easy reach of Symond's Yat, Tintern and Llantony Abbeys, four famous castles.

The neighbourhood offers fishing, rough shooting, riding, golf, bathing, tennis and delightful walking.

TERMS

Three Guineas a Week. No Extras.
Special terms for Reading Parties.

SPRINGHERNE, Bull's Hill, WALFORD, ROSS-ON-WYE.

Tel. 293

THE Busy Man's Reliable Literary Assistant. Researches made and data supplied by experienced author. Confidence guaranteed. D.W. 1, Waverley Mansions, Kenton Street, W.C.1

CHURCH NEEDLEWORK PARTY OF THE CHURCH UNION.—Over 400 Churches at home and overseas helped with Altar Linen and Vestments, etc. GIFTS of material, new or second-hand, and cash urgently required.—Send to Hon. Secretary: E. CURRY, 71 Beaufort Road, St. Leonards-on-Sea.

READERS of the *Modern Churchman* are asked to support our advertisers, and to mention the *Modern Churchman* when replying to advertisements in our pages.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

—o—

BINDING CASES

for Volume XXVIII

4s. 6d. each, post free

Messrs. OVENELL & FOWLES, 5 Alfred Street, Oxford, will be happy to bind volumes of 'The Modern Churchman' for a charge, including the case, of 6s. 6d. a volume, postage extra.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 2. MAY, 1939. Vol. XXIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Before the Killing Begins.

The following letter by Dean Matthews, published in *The Times* of April 29, has attracted much attention:

Sir,—At moments we climb out of our daily preoccupations and catch a glimpse of the world as it is. At such times we forget the questions which normally are so pressing — policy, national interests, personal hopes and fears — and we understand that we are living in a world where the most civilized nations are preparing feverishly to slaughter each other's common people, and that all the resources of science are being mobilized for that end. I am no pacifist. I believe that there are causes for which it is our duty, in the last resort, to fight; but I believe also that few things which we count valuable would survive a world war. Before the killing begins let us look round for the spiritual force which might save us.

Where shall we find it? The international forces seem to have faded away. The fellowship of science from which we hoped so much is made something of a mockery when the embattled nations depend on the services of rival 'medicine men.' The 'solidarity of the workers' has turned out once more to be an illusion. We shall get no reconciliation through Labour when the leaders of Labour in this country are not on speaking terms with the leaders of the *Arbeitsfront*. We are driven back on that ancient, terribly confused, and widely despised international force—the Christian Church and the Christian faith.

I want to urge that now is the time for the leaders of the Christian Church to act; now, before the killing has begun. Those who can speak with authority for the Christian Church have a terrible responsibility *now*. For the most part they are old men; they are hemmed in by tradition and by memories of past controversies. Anything courageous which they do will offend the timid and conventional. But they

can speak to the latent Christian consciousness of Europe as no others can, if they dare. If war comes without the maximum effort of the Christian Churches to prevent it, our leaders will be condemned by posterity; that might not matter; they will be condemned by the Master in whose name they speak. It will be a disaster and a betrayal if any considerations of dignity, of ecclesiastical or theological punctilio, or of purely national policy stand in the way of a united Christian witness for peace. If the Pope could forget for a while that he is infallible and his Church the only true one, and if the Archbishop of Canterbury could forget that he is a part of the English Constitution, and if they could both remember that they are ministers of Christ, we might see great things. Let us hear the Word of God before the killing begins.

Yours, etc.,

St. Paul's Deanery, E.C.4, April 25. W. R. MATTHEWS.

This plea was reinforced by Dr. Alexander Martin of Edinburgh in the following letter published in *The Times* of May 1 :

SIR,—Is there to be no compelling rally to the most relevant and courageous suggestion made in these columns by the Dean of St. Paul's yesterday? Spiritual appeals on the situation are being raised on every side, some of them, like the Free Churchmen's appearing alongside his letter, couched in terms of real wisdom and force. But, with all possible respect, why sectional utterances? The Dean suggests the common ground which Christians have to stand on. We are back, in short, at the point to which the Archbishop of Canterbury brought this high matter in the House of Lords a month ago: is no more to be heard of the all-inclusive action he then referred to as a possibility and with which, it had since been learned, Cardinal Hinsley was in agreement? It is earnestly to be hoped that Dr. Matthews will pursue what he has been led to press for.

What the hour demands is a truly Catholic assertion of the essential Christian maxims and the faith that sustains them, one expressive of the conviction of all Christians including those under totalitarian rule, and that should once for all, so to say, brand this threatened war and the entire conception of life and the ordering of affairs bound up with it, for the suicidal, Godless, and vain thing all know it to be. The President's invitation summons the nations to what is, in principle and details apart, the plain, sane, human, and, above all, Christian way out of the present imbroglio. Dare the Church of Christ—with the fate of Christendom and the world itself literally trembling in the balance—refrain from reinforcing its purport with an emphatic attestation of the authority and power over all life and conduct of the principles which are implied in it? Let some Catholic confession be at least upon record against the time when this incredible chapter in European history comes to be written. Nevertheless, its immediate relevance is now—'before the killing begins.'

Edinburgh, April 28. Yours, ALEX. MARTIN.

Although a united declaration by the heads of all the Christian Churches, asserting both the criminality and the futility of a European war waged to secure the welfare of the belligerents,

and reinforced by the further declaration that such a war, in the case of those who initiated it, is absolutely contrary to the principles of the Christian religion, would be profoundly true, we may well question whether such utterances would carry any weight in political circles. Those who are resolved to secure 'living room,' 'colonial empire,' 'world trade,' and the triumph of their own social and political ideology would be entirely uninfluenced by such a pronouncement. Those unhappy nations which are forced to resort to arms in order to withstand aggression might reasonably reply to such a declaration by our Christian theologians: 'We know only too well the truth of what you assert, and would most gladly abstain from war if thereby the freedom and security of peace-loving communities could be secured. But this seems to us to be impossible except by armed resistance to aggression.'

If the Christian Churches, by educational methods which they have neglected or rejected, could have promoted the Christian spirit in Europe during the last forty years, the political situation would have been very different to-day. But they have failed to do this. We venture to point out that to appeal to nations on the very verge of war to act now, in obedience to principles which the Churches have failed to make potent in national life in prolonged periods of peace, must almost certainly be doomed to failure. We all know, it may be justly asserted, the things which belong unto our peace. They are not hid from our eyes. There is no need for Popes or Archbishops to declare them to us. What we really need to know—we speak for the nations who are preparing to resist aggression—is this: How is it possible rightly to act otherwise than we are doing?

The honest, humane and well-meant policy of Appeasement has failed. The policy of Non-aggression, equally humane, honest, and perhaps more judicious in the light of our experience, has taken its place. Is there any other policy which has claims to replace the latter? If our Christian leaders can tell us what that policy is, our statesmen will be glad to hear them. Our ecclesiastical rulers and leaders (except they be pacifists) have, as far as we know, no such policy to commend. Need they speak to us again of the appalling suffering and destructiveness which modern warfare must inevitably entail?

It may be replied that it is their duty to do this and they cannot do it too often. The more united they are in doing this, the more likely they are to make their appeals influential. We cannot deny their right and duty to act in this way if their consciences compel them to do so, but we do doubt whether it can be of any use now. Prayer even now has its place and efficacy, but it seems to us that the time for preaching is past. Bishop Jeremy Taylor wrote: 'The lesson of how to die well is best learnt by men in health.' The leaders of the pact for non-aggression are Christians in the sense that their policy is Christian. Their opponents are not Christian, and we cannot honestly believe that anything which the leaders of the Christian Churches may say to such will have any effect whatsoever in persuading them to abandon their policies. Hitler and Mussolini have their justification for their policies, but that justification is not Christian and they make no pretence that it is.

Lord Elton and Canon Streeter.

Lord Elton, recently appointed Secretary to the Rhodes Trust, and well known as a great popular educationist by all who listen to his delightful talks on the wireless, has in his recent autobiography, *Among Others*, given his impressions of the late Canon B. H. Streeter, Provost of Queen's College, Oxford. He writes of his extraordinary shrewdness, his kindness of heart, his disregard of material things, the quaintness of his manners, but deprecates his Modernism:

> 'Streeter was something much more attractive than a modernist theologian.' 'This was not the side of him which attracted me personally, for on the whole, if my simple beliefs are to be undermined, I prefer the undermining not to be done by a beneficed clergyman of the Church from which I learnt them' (p. 195).

This charge of undermining the faith brought against Canon Streeter by a distinguished layman cannot be passed over without comment. For multitudes throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations, and in the great mission fields of India, China and Japan, Streeter was regarded as the most eminent and influential of modern apologists for the Christian faith. This was indeed a remarkable achievement for one who in academic circles was known as a very acute, erudite and original critic of the New Testament.

Streeter began his work as a Christian apologist in the dark days of the Great War, when the Christian faith of many was being strained to the uttermost. In those days, two widely influential and helpful volumes of essays were edited by him, *Immortality* in 1917 and *Concerning Prayer* in 1918. In 1919 appeared another volume of collected essays, *The Spirit*, no less helpful, and, in the same year, *God and the Struggle for Existence*. In 1926 appeared *Reality*, the most widely read of all his apologies for Christianity. This was translated into a number of foreign languages, Western and Eastern. In 1927, *Adventure* followed, a volume of essays to which he contributed and of which he was Editor. Then came his Bampton Lectures, *The Buddha and the Christ*, 1932. His last volume of Christian apology, *The God who Speaks*, appeared only a few months before his death in 1937.

All these volumes aimed at convincing their readers of the truth of the Christian faith and in encouraging them to lead the Christian life, and multitudes of readers are grateful for them. It is therefore astonishing that a graduate of the same University and an intimate friend of this distinguished Christian apologist can presume to charge Streeter with undermining the faith.

What is popularly called undermining the faith is really undermining erroneous traditions which have become identified in men's minds with the Christian faith but are no real part of it. These traditions are usually of the nature of accretions and superstitions the real character of which has been revealed by modern critical research. In many cases these accretions and superstitions popularly identified with the Christian religion constitute a widespread reason for the rejection of that religion. He who shows, as Canon Streeter did, that these things are no true part of the Christian religion is defending the faith, not undermining it. Surely the clergy, if they are honest and competent teachers of the Christian religion, ought to be the first to correct errors in its traditional presentation.

Lord Elton's jibe about Streeter being a 'beneficed clergyman of the Church' reproduces once again the popular fallacy that the clergy are ordained to be teachers, not primarily of Christian Truth, but of Christian Tradition.

A Layman's Criticism and Appeal.

We publish the following letter because it represents the feeling of many English laymen at home and abroad. Ecclesiastics encounter this kind of lay protest much too little and are disposed almost to ignore its existence. It is well for the clergy especially to be reminded of it.

I.

In a letter which you were forbearing enough to publish a few years ago I made an attack on ecclesiasticism which one or two of your contributors described as 'very intemperate.' I thought then, and I think now, that with English church-people it is only the so-called intemperate words that have any effect, however they may hurt or shock at the time. After long attendance at service in churches it is only the occasional high-explosive which lifts our thoughts above the level of church customs and conventions.

I am therefore going to venture another *bomb*. People do not go to church, nor do they respect churches, because, fundamentally, churches do not teach the truth—or, worse still, teach only half-a-truth (which is as bad as half-a-lie); and because those who are content with half-a-truth (or half-a-lie) are so plainly consistent in their week-day 'half-and-half' philosophy that no one has any respect for them. By their fruits ye shall know them. *The plain fact is that the Church and its creeds are dead, and the sight of vested partisans standing over the corpse and proclaiming its vitality fills men with sorrow or derision.*

II.

I know of course that 'the Church must give us truth only when we can bear it,' but really our people bear truth readily and courageously, and we can stand a whole lot more of it. I honestly believe that our nation is on the brink of catastrophe through lack of true spiritual guidance, and that the time has now come when the Church must throw in its hand or 'own up,' even at the expense of the dear old ladies in the pews. And I earnestly pray that the M.C.U. will not be satisfied with what has been won so far.

Is it, I wonder, *only* a wise statesmanship that withholds truth till we can bear it? Prelates are proverbially proud people, and when they sternly call the nation to duty in one breath, and own up to their obsolete beliefs in another, they cancel themselves out. I would however ask them this question: In what other walk of life or profession is truth so suppressed, and even so persecuted? What should we think of our professional brethren and scientists if, by a series of re-interpretations and mental reservations, they concealed the light given them, and evaded acknowledgment of past errors? Phrases can be terrible things, and the 'truth once delivered' is one of the most terribly misunderstood.

III.

'Well, what would you do if you were the Archbishop of Canterbury; would you like his job?' This was a question once put to me by a padre during a long railway journey. I said I should 'require notice,' and we turned in for the night. It was a fair question, how-

ever. What *would* an observant man in the late fifties do, knowing the responsibilities of fairly high office, and with thirty-six years' working experience behind him at home and abroad? Perhaps it will be better, if our enquiry is to be strictly impartial, if we forget we are talking about religion as such, and substitute the word 'water.'

Ex hypothesi, we will suppose that for many decades our water supply has been deteriorating. Our people are suffering from lack of pure water, and the symptoms have been traced to their cause. Water is a necessity of life; what we thought was pure water turns out to be tainted; we must act immediately.

Good. We will first have a 'fact-finding' committee and give it twelve months to send in its report. Members: doctors, chemists, and bacteriologists; others, perhaps, who have suffered and cured themselves; civil engineers who build reservoirs and lay pipes; administrators; someone to turn technical details into words more generally understood, and so on.

Secondly, another committee. Here are the facts: Source pure, but catchment area tainted by misuse and carelessness. Service tanks with centuries of deposit on walls and bottom; supply pipes corroded nearly full-bore. Water contains such and such impurities; pending reconstruction can be improved by such and such palliatives.

IV.

No doubt the fundamentalists and traditionalists will challenge the hypothesis; and even we, who are modernists in thought, may do well to remind ourselves of our case against the Churches. Very well; we accuse them:

(*a*) of teaching tradition, unsupported historically, as truth;
(*b*) of teaching legend, allegory and myth as truth, in the sense that something actually happened as stated, and not as allegory or symbol;
(*c*) of teaching contradictory reports and principles as being both true, *e.g.* the purely physical and purely spiritual Resurrection and Ascension;
(*d*) of incorporating with the teaching of Jesus, which now requires none of them, and suffers from them, vital elements of the Jewish and Mystery religions (perhaps unavoidable at the time);
(*e*) of being aware that much in the Old and New Testaments is not God's Word, and of constantly quoting passages as true and inspired, knowing them to be untrue or at least doubtful; and
(*f*) of retaining creeds, a prayer book, a hymn book, and certain devotional practices which were built upon a foundation now seen to be imperfect and even harmful, and which now hide the light from those who would fain see.

V.

If anyone wishes to see for himself the muddle we are in, let him examine carefully the hymn books. Take one of the later ones, *Songs of Praise,* and go through it thoroughly, analysing and weighing the spirit and meaning of each verse. I have done this, and it really is a profitable labour, for by the time you are half through the book you nave discovered that fifty per cent of the hymns are either weak, untrue, ambiguous, or mere doggerel, utterly unworthy for praise or thanksgiving, while, on the other hand, perhaps twenty-five per cent.

are strong and fine and show up clearly the faults of the others. It is all due to the fact that we have not thought out what we really do believe, and our poetical output is exactly what we should expect it to be, a curious miscellany of hope and despair, of affirmation and resignation, of dogma and anti-dogma, of pious or sentimental words without any apparent meaning, and of pulpit platitudes repeated in every possible permutation and combination.

Perhaps one of the most striking things, most humiliating to the Church, I should think, is the difference in literary quality and spiritual feeling between hymns written by laymen and by clergymen. I refer of course to the majority, not to some magnificent exceptions. What a wonderful task for a nation to set itself! A new hymnal based on the eternal verities: Courage and Truth, Beauty and Goodwill!

VI.

So there it is. What do I want? I want a conference selected from all those who profess and call themselves lovers of truth, whether modernists or not, clerical or lay, scholars or workers, men or women; and from them I want:

(i) The Gospel of Jesus in the light of modern research;
(ii) A new Creed (the M.C.U.'s is the best I have yet seen);
(iii) A new prayer and hymn book based on (i) and (ii) and expressing grandeur, truth and simplicity, suitable for all classes and all minds, exactly as the accepted parables of Jesus show forth the same qualities; and
(iv) The framework of an organization for outward observances and utterances which lives and dresses like ordinary decent folk, and which observes a standard of justice, charity and kindness within itself at least equal to that of a good government service, or an old mercantile house of good name.

I will not believe that our country no longer has the courage and inner light to bring these things into being. At any rate, do not let us fold our hands and wait for the 'inevitability of gradualness.' The times are indeed urgent, and, with other nations as we see them today, may we not believe with Milton that God is waiting for His Englishmen?

Much that our layman demands is being very gradually achieved. We are sorry indeed that progress is so slow, but how few are willing to work for reform compared with the multitude who complain of the need for it. The vast mass of the disgruntled laity have lapsed either into indifference or pessimism. For the most part practising reformers are clergymen, working under obvious limitations and disadvantages. When we consider the magnitude of the task, it is clear that we need a vastly increased body of lay help. If the pace of reformation is to be accelerated we need a great increase in the number and activity of our lay supporters We recognize the need for moving forward faster, but the reform movement must fail if it takes only a small minority with it. The old cry, 'Reformation with-

out tarrying for any,' if acted on, can only end in schism and ultimate failure.

The Modernist Reformation must be based upon education, not on protests and slogans, and that education has to be fundamental and widespread. This means not only much organization and a body of trained workers, but time in which to achieve enduring results. Moreover there must be continuity both of organization, thought and feeling. We are not dealing with water, but with human beings existing in a great historic society. As Canon Richardson has pointed out in a paper published in this issue, the new must be linked to the old. This is illustrated to some extent in Dr. Dearmer's *Songs of Praise*. His hymn-book could never have secured its present publicity and influence if it had not included a certain number of 'old favourites' whose theology and sentimentality our correspondent condemns. Moreover, the latest and best edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* would not have come into existence if it had not been for *Songs of Praise*.

The main things which our correspondent demands are needful, but as Modernist Churchmen we can only claim them for ourselves as alternatives. Traditionalists must be allowed to retain their ancient formularies and doctrines. Progress with comprehensiveness must be our watchword, and all advance must be based on education. This policy is slow but sure.

Astrologers in Conference.

When King Belshazzar saw the handwriting on the wall but was unable to read it, he commanded to call in the astrologers. The astrologers failed to provide the interpretation. They seem, however, to have survived this failure and have recently been holding a convention in Harrogate. Some people of pedestrian mind may ask: Who are the astrologers and what is the use of astrology? The most modern of answers is provided by Mr. H. B. Pilkington, whose portrait is given, together with those of other distinguished astrologers, in an illustrated article in the *Picture Post* of April 29, 1939. Mr. Pilkington defines astrology and its uses as follows:

> 'That science which studies the signs of the Zodiac, the planets and the fixed stars and the relationship of their phenomena to phenomena occurring on our earth even to the remotest details of human

character and human destiny. The true astrologer tries to explain to his client the nature of the cosmic influences which he may be handling at any given time so that, whatever their nature, he can use them to the best advantage.'

Viewed historically, astrology is very ancient. It was old when Jesus Christ was born at Bethlehem and the Magi, or Persian astrologers, came to worship Him and offer Him gifts. When Abraham set out from Ur of the Chaldees in the third millenium B.C. in search of the Promised Land, astrology was well established in Mesopotamia, as we learn from great collections of astrological clay tablets.

Whatever else astrology may be, it is an interesting survival of primitive culture. It goes back to a period when science and religion were not separated: indeed, when science still existed in the womb of religion but was not yet born. Astrology is the parent of our modern astronomy, and had learnt not a little about the heavenly bodies and their movements, even to the extent of being able to predict eclipses, before the seventh century B.C. But in those days it was essentially a religion, and no mean rival to the religion of Israel. The heavenly bodies which it studied were for it, not systems of matter, but deities—divine beings who exerted powerful influences over human lives and destinies. He who had learnt to predict the movements of the stars had also learnt how to predict coming events in human history. The stars which were in the ascendant at a human birth determined, not only that human being's character, but also his fate. Hence the practice of casting horoscopes. The influence of astrology is seen in our native language in such words as ill-starred, disastrous. Shakespeare would seem to have protested against this influence when he makes one of his characters declare:

'It is not in our stars
But in ourselves that we are underlings.'

But this is only one more indication of how far Shakespeare was ahead of his times.

When astronomy was well launched on its way, men of scientific mind who were interested in the stars became astronomers, but those of mystical and magical temperament became astrologers. What then is astrology to-day? It is certainly not a science. It would perhaps be too dignified to describe it as an art: some might call it a craft. For many it is a recreation and

for others a business undertaking. Provided this be recognized, little harm is done by astrology. The danger and detriment befall, however, when astrology is taken seriously as either science or religion.

Unfortunately there still appear to be, to judge from what occurred at Harrogate, astrologers who view astrology either as a science or a religion, or as both. And even more unfortunately there appears to be a growing multitude in this land which believes them. This is not only a serious reflection on the quality of our modern English culture and education, but on the influence of the Christian Church. It should be as impossible for a Christian to believe in astrology as for any scientist to do so. Faith in God's government of the Universe and of human life permits no place for the absurdities of astrological influences on human character and human destiny. That sort of thing belongs to the sphere of magic and has no place, or should have no place, in the religion of Christ. Magical beliefs are like weeds in a garden, which are ever ready to spring up when the cultivation of the garden is neglected. Whenever the rational, moral and spiritual view of life becomes weakened the magical begins to assert itself. It is to lack of belief that we are living in a law-governed Universe, that the belief in fate and luck and chance are due—a dangerous and demoralising element should it become dominant in our national life. And this is not so impossible as it seems. In the United States astrology has achieved an extraordinary influence. It receives wide popularity through the wireless: many newspapers publish a daily horoscope. A publishing firm of high standing has issued 'a serious work on astrology written with special consideration for household and family problems.' For further examples of this sort of thing see Dr. A. Thomen's scathing volume, *Doctors Don't Believe it*. Such recrudescence of primitive ways of feeling and thinking and acting demands the serious attention of our educationists.

The author of the Deuteronomic Law commanded the extirpation of all magicians as an abomination unto the Lord. Such methods to-day are neither permissible nor desirable. Sound education, which ought to be both scientific and religious, is the sure and only remedy. But when we observe the amount of magic which exists and is even fostered in ecclesiastical Chris-

tianity, ought we to look to the Church or to the State to apply this remedy effectively?

Behind the Scenes.

Some eight thousand of the clergy petitioned the Upper Houses of Convocation to reject the *Doctrinal Report*. The Bishops almost unanimously disregarded these protests, but the impression made by these petitions to Convocation was a depressing one for those who hoped that clerical enlightenment and tolerance were on the increase. The protests appeared to indicate a degree of obscurantism and intolerance which not only accounted for the failing influence of the Church, but promised ill for its revival. There are indications, however, that many of the clergy who signed these petitions were not impelled by motives of obscurantism and intolerance, but merely by docility. They would seem in a number of cases to have been misled, and to have placed too much confidence in their representatives in the Lower Houses of Convocation. The following description of what happened recently in a Rural Deanery which we are not at liberty to name supports this interpretation :

> 'Yesterday we had an extraordinary meeting to consider the Resolution which was presented to the Upper House of Convocation and ignored. You know the Resolution to which I refer — requesting the Bishops to issue a statement to the effect that the Church accepts the Nicene Creed *"in that sense in which the Church has ever held it,"* etc. The Proctor in Convocation appears to have asked one of the local clergy to propose the resolution and to find somebody—preferably an Evangelical—to second it. No notice was sent to the Rural Dean, and we were under the impression that the whole thing was unofficial, and only yesterday did we discover that the Proctor was apparently acting under instructions from Convocation, to find out the feeling in the deaneries of the Diocese. Presumably the same thing is being done in other dioceses with a view to trying to force the Upper House to give the ruling which the reactionaries desire. As far as our Rural Deanery is concerned, the result was a most smashing victory for liberalism. The proposer was by no means convinced that he was in favour of the Resolution, and personally, from my knowledge of the man, I cannot conceive why he ever undertook to propose it, since he claims to be a man of independent judgment! His speech was lukewarm, to say the least of it, and he passed on the matter to another man who was understood to have said that he would second the motion. But when he heard the terms of the Resolution, this man declared that he would have nothing to do with it at all, since in its present form it committed the Church to all sorts of impossible beliefs such as the resurrection of the earthly body and pre-Copernican view of the universe. That brought a deadlock, for nobody present was prepared to second. The Rural Dean asked whether, if the Resolution were differently worded, anybody would be prepared to second it. No-

body was prepared to do so. Then followed a very animated and amusing discussion — it cannot be called a debate — which ended in a counter-resolution being proposed and seconded and unanimously carried. The counter-resolution read as follows: "That this Chapter, while firmly maintaining the Divinity of Our Lord, holds fast to the value of freedom of thought in the Church of England." (Quite a number of those present do accept the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of Christ.)

The Rural Dean and I and the Chapter Clerk, who is also a liberal though not a member of the M.C.U., had come to the meeting equipped with all sorts of heavy armaments, prepared for battle royal, in order to get the Resolution turned down, and we felt that probably we should just about win, but we never had the opportunity to fire a shot; the enemy were not there or proved to be fighting on our side. We certainly spoke, but it was not in order to turn the others, for all were on our side, and, without any attempt at influencing them, a very decided Anglo-Catholic proposed, and another man—the original seconder, as it happens — seconded this counter-resolution, which as I say was carried unanimously. To my knowledge two of the clergy were in favour of the original resolution, and possibly a third, but these three apparently thought discretion the better part of valour and did not attend the meeting at all! Of the men who did turn up, three were Anglo-Catholics—evidently Liberal Catholics—and the remainder either Liberal Evangelicals or Moderates, though I was the only representative of the M.C.U. present.'

We believe that many of the eight thousand clergy signed the protest against the *Doctrinal Report* not only without having read the Report but without in the least realizing what those in authority in the Church thought of the Report. Ardent traditionalists (Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical) in the Lower Houses of the Convocations raised a note of alarm and summoned their clerical electors to defend the Faith. Defence of the Faith in this case required no more than to sign on a dotted line, insert the document in an addressed envelope, and post it. But after the signatories had studied the Bishops' speeches in Convocation, not a few of them would seem to have come to doubt the wisdom of their protest.

The distribution of clerical party feeling in the rural deanery described is probably characteristic of the great majority of our rural deaneries. The number of the clergy in the rural deanery may be set down at twenty-four: three are rigid Anglo-Catholics; three are convinced Modernists, but only one of the three openly; the remaining eighteen are Moderates or Liberal Evangelicals. This means that, given time for reflection and enlightened and judicious leadership, they will ultimately prove loyal to the English spirit, reject extremes of policy, and stand for comprehensiveness and tolerance, if not for progress.

NOTES ON THE LIFE OF A MODERNIST

(By Request.)

I WAS born in a quiet, serene Christian home — precious beyond words to look back upon; an old-fashioned Evangelical father and a devout High Church mother who knew Keble's *Christian Year* almost by heart — its melodies haunt me now. I, like thousands of others, breathed that moral and spiritual atmosphere through childhood; I knew nothing else; I thought everyone was brought up like that; and the great eternal influences passed silently into my child's consciousness inevitably, as the most natural things in the world, like the sky and the fields and the river and the trees. I became a religious child — with many faults but at home in the realm of wonder and heavenly things. Boyhood and early youth, with their special difficulties and battering trials, continued the tale. Sports and (later) travel gave vigour and breadth to my faith; Oxford gave beauty and companionship, gave me here and there glimpses into English religious history, its loveliness, its errors, its sufferings, its quiet confidence — very imperfectly realizing this heritage I yet felt in it a certain strength and repose. My creed, if it could be called such, was exceedingly simple — deep confidence in the Bible and a consuming love for the Church. Thus I moved forward to manhood, unquestioning (for the most part) and happy.

Then in about my twenty-third year a devastating thing happened, a really fearful, trembling thing for me, never to be forgotten. The lights went out; the path was hidden and the journey lost its aim; the heavenly things, my old solace and delight, vanished; there was no God, and the world was empty. What had happened? *Materialism.*

Two small books opened for me this dread philosophy. (1) Herbert Spencer's *The Study of Sociology*; (2) Tyndall's famous address before the British Association at Belfast in 1874. These two books could hardly be described as strictly materialistic, but they broke down the fences and opened the door to-

ward Materialism. Other writers, still more negative, drove home the lesson — Bain, Maudsley, W. K. Clifford, Strauss in *The Old Faith and the New*; and for a year or more I pined in that cruel, disenchanted universe. The exact time and manner in which the awfulness of this creed dawned upon me, if it be not too trivial for mention, was this. At a beautiful spot on the road from Kenilworth to Warwick one day I stood in a snowstorm; it was different from all snowstorms I had ever seen. Those old snowstorms I had watched with delight when they were the play of purpose, the flakes beautifully falling and intermingling according to the intent of the Creator — they were then beneficent and in a certain sense I felt a kinship with them; both they and I were working out a divine plan. But this snowstorm was dead; the flakes fell against each other by an iron necessity; it was all blind and merciless; I was afraid of it. Mr. J. W. Donne has lately written on the subject thus (*The New Immortality*, pp. 12, 13).

> 'Those of you who can recall still that bad half-hour when first it dawned upon you that materialism might be true will remember that the thing which was then repressed . . . was a *rage* — a fury with the universe at the futility of these needless flickerings of human existence.'

For me, quite unlike that, there was a sense of overpowering, dumbfounding, infinite *loss*; a drowning pathos and despair. Life had become a death-chamber. How could I escape? Who would help me out?

I was rescued by three distinguished books and by many obscure people. The volume which faced Materialism for me with boldness and quiet imperturbable confidence was Schwegler's *History of Philosophy*. Here, ranged against each other in serried ranks down the centuries, were the Idealists and (under various titles) the Materialists; and in the tug-of-war between them Schwegler threw in his weight on the Idealist side, so that the Idealists almost always won. James Hutchison Stirling, the virile Scotch translator and editor, pulled the same way. I read that little book again and again; I had it interleaved and wrote out my own account of each chapter; no novel — not *Ivanhoe*, *Adam Bede*, *Les Misérables*—ever absorbed me more. Saved by its influence I had recovered my spiritual nerve and was a religious man again.

This deliverance was confirmed by much reading of Carlyle. One passage, for instance, in *The French Revolution*, spoke as with the voice of the old Hebrew prophets to me:

> 'The Church: what a word was there; richer than Golconda and the treasures of the world! In the heart of the remotest mountains rises the little Kirk; the Dead all slumbering round it, under their white memorial stones "in hope of a happy resurrection":— dull wert thou, O Reader, if never in any hour (say of moaning midnight, when such Kirk hung spectral in the sky, and Being was as if swallowed up of Darkness) it spoke to thee — things unspeakable that went into thy soul's soul. Strong was he who had a Church, what we call a Church; he stood thereby, though "in the centre of Immensities, in the conflux of Eternities," yet manlike towards God and man; the vague shoreless Universe had become for him a firm city, and dwelling which he knew.'

Last, not least, was the *De Imitatione Christi*. This incomparable little volume insisted, with compelling, quiet authority, that it is not thought only or chiefly, but love, suffering, sacrifice which open the gates of Life. *Qui sequitur me, non ambulat in tenebris, dicit Dominus. Cui aeternum verbum loquitur, a multis opininionibus expeditur.* Of course, a large number of other books brought support; though not a great student nor at all highly educated, I did read many works of spiritual tendency, among them works of genius, and I became confirmed for life as fundamentally, with fearful inadequacies, a Christian.

The other, additional powerful help for me in my religious recovery was the beautful Christian lives of simple people around me — some more educated, others labourers or peasants. I instinctively felt deep down that they had a spiritual secret which I had not and which I would give the world to gain. The tranquility, the joy of their look was a more commanding argument than volumes of theological dialectic. I tried to associate as much as possible with them, to find out their devotional habits and to share their experience. It is the healing secret for lonely, broken souls. The Holy Spirit will not speak through those simple Christians at once; I persevered; the living, hidden Christ was within my reach; at length I *recognized* Him; He spoke to me not in their language exactly, but in my language; 'If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me.'

After Materialism came the other difficulty, *Biblical Criticism*. In the middle of the last century Biblical Criticism, which

may be, of course, and often is conservative, broke out in a kind of destructive rebellion. The masterpieces of revolt were Strauss's *Life of Jesus* and the lighter, brilliant Life by Rénan. What here concerns me is Strauss's work. I read it with astonishment and pain. It was all new to me and incredible; yet it moved forward from page to page and from chapter to chapter with the awful weight of Strauss's learning and power. It was a steam roller crushing a child. The mythical theory seemed to me deadly. 'They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.' On the Easter Sunday morning, after reading this book, I was approaching the little Church outside my home in Warwick intending to receive the cherished Easter Communion; I could not enter the building; I moved off to the beautiful lanes and woods around with a fearful sense of deprivation and loneliness.

To cut the story short, I gradually recovered. Leading thoughtful Churchmen helped me. Dean Stanley was my hero; *Ecce homo* seemed to be the work of a splendidly reasonable Christian; Lightfoot was strong and calm; so also, in what little I knew of him, was Hort; J. M. Wilson, then Head master of Clifton, wrote to me a letter of invaluable encouragement; gradually I found my way in criticism to a liberal, in some respects radical, view of the Bible, which, however, in its inner and essential message to mankind seemed to me, as it seems now, to be of supreme and undying validity.[1]

Could a man of such liberal views take Holy Orders? That is a question which faced and threatened liberal ordinands fifty

[1] Of course the difficulties of Biblical Criticism have now moved far away from the tale I have been telling. The most formidable corrosive to-day, I suppose, is not the mythical theory but Form-criticism. Bultmann has been called *Strauss redivivus*. I am far from being sufficiently instructed here to express an opinion of any worth. I would only say that even an extreme presentation of Form-criticism would not seem to me to be fatal to the veracity, the overwhelming intrinsic virtue of the Gospel narrative. Indeed a certain new element of unpremeditated, unprepared *life-likeness* would mark the story if it was told in the first place not by one disciplined, calm scholar, the Evangelist, but from the naïve, impulsive witness of groups of living Christians who had found the narrated teaching and events momentous in their lives. Dr. Vincent Taylor writes: '*We see Jesus better*, for we behold Him, not only in the final form which the tradition assumes in the Gospels, but also in the lives, thoughts, and desires of men throughout the formative period.'

years ago; it faces and threatens liberal ordinands now. It presented itself most formidably to me in Morley's *On Compromise*, the classical challenge to perplexed and hesitating students for the Ministry. I walked about the fields near my home for (I think) weeks battling in my own mind with Morley's dissuasions and threats. At last I did something which I venture to recommend as a habit to younger men; I wrote for myself in an old copybook, with scrupulous care, an essay on Morley's volume, and I discovered that for me, quietly face to face with my own conscience, the attack failed and that I was free to go forward. I decided to offer myself for ordination.

There has appeared recently in *The Times* and elsewhere a strong attack by our orthodox assailants on the honesty and integrity of Modernist clergy. Our assailants appear to me to be unconsciously, but extraordinarily, disingenuous. For many centuries *some* articles of the Creed have been historically or symbolically (not literally) interpreted; for instance, (1) 'Maker of heaven and earth,' (2) 'He descended into hell,' (3) 'He ascended into heaven,' (4) 'And sitteth at the right hand of God,' (5) 'He shall come to judge,' (6) 'The Resurrection of the body.' Our orthodox assailants — almost all the thoughtful and educated among them — calmly appropriate most or all of these evolved and adapted interpretations without admitting for a moment that they, the assailants, owe these critical benefits to the struggles, the sufferings, sometimes the genius, always the courage and integrity of the Broad Church clergy of past generations, *our* critical ancestors, whom the critical ancestors of our assailants would, if they could, have stoned. Then, when some of us would add one more clause or clauses to the group of symbolical interpretation, *e.g.* (7) 'The third day he rose again from the dead,' our assailants, posing as critical innocents, turn round and rebuke, and sometimes, I fear, insult us for not stopping at the exact spot in critical evolution at which they themselves happen to have stopped.[2]

I will only add that the leader to whom we English clergy mainly owe our critical liberty, life, and hope, and who suffered

[2] Of course we hope that someday not a re-interpreted Creed, but an amended Creed, shorter and more vital, will be accepted by authority.

long and sometimes most painful misrepresentation for it and for us, was Hastings Rashdall—if I may add a personal note, a character in whom were most lovably combined strength and humility, reverence and courage, a priceless legacy to Modernism. To me the other great champion of critical freedom was Baron Fr. von Hügel. The particular underlying lesson which he taught came from his devotional genius, his genius for prayer, especially intercessory prayer; he brought criticism and all other interests into relation with the Eternal, and they assumed an indescribable grandeur and sanctity. His published *Selected Letters* are, if I may venture to say so, packed with wisdom. At the top of it all I would, if I were permitted, place this sentence from a letter dated October 28th, 1912, to an old friend: 'Pray for me, please, as I do daily, and thrice daily for you.'

HUBERT HANDLEY.

THE CLUE TO HISTORY*

By DR. REINHOLD NIEBUHR.

IT is impossible to read anything from the pen of Professor MacMurray without admiration for the creative resourcefulness of his mind and the lucidity of his thought. His new book is the most brilliant of his many efforts to interpret the Christian religion in relation to the social problems of our era. It must be admitted that his interpretation of Biblical religion is highly tendencious and that, either wittingly or unwittingly, he overlooks very large segments of the Christian truth. His basic thesis is sound enough. It is that Hebraic religion is monistic and is free from the mind-body dualism of Greek modes of thought; and that as a consequence Biblical religion, culminating in the thought of Jesus, conceives history as a realm of meaning, in contrast to the Greek concept of a realm of pure being above history. God acts, according to the Hebraic conception, and history is a realm of decision and action. Man's ultimate good is not contemplation but self-realization. Since he is meant for community, his final good is self-realization through

* *The Clue to History*. By John MacMurray. (S.C.M., 1939. 7*s*. 6*d*.)

community. If he seeks to realize himself at the expense of the whole he must fail. According to MacMurray, the prophetic interpretation of history rests primarily upon the recognition of the inevitability of this failure. If man acts egocentrically he acts against the structure of his own being and must fail.

> 'When men set out to realize an intention which is opposite to the divine intention they do not achieve it. They achieve something they do not intend. If the intention is opposite to the divine intention they necessarily achieve, not what they intend, but its opposite,'

declares Prof. MacMurray. The meaning of history is, in other words, that 'God maketh the wrath of man to praise him.'

It is impossible to do full justice to all the rich insights with which MacMurray elaborates this theme and portrays history as a judgment upon the self-will of men, particularly upon the lust of power and the luxury of contemplation instead of action. MacMurray's contribution is to emphasize the monistic elements in Hebraic thought in opposition to the dualism which has insinuated itself into Christianity through Hellenism. He rightly sees that Marxism contains an element of true religion in its anti-idealism which must be recaptured; but unfortunately he accepts Marxian naturalism too uncritically and fails at every point to understand Christianity where the transcendence of God is the principle of understanding. He fails to see that Christian faith transcends both idealism and materialism to the degree that it understands the concept of the Creator and Creation. God as Creator is the source of both form and vitality in Christian thought. He is not, as in Platonism, the mind which forms the formless stuff of matter. Both mind and matter are created by him *ex nihilo*; both are dependent upon Him, both are involved in finiteness and neither are evil by virtue of their involvement in the finite process. Just as MacMurray fails to understand the transcendence of God, he fails to understand the transcendence of the human spirit. When Christianity declares that man is made in the 'image of God' it asserts that man as transcendent spirit, man as spirit which stands outside itself and the world, can understand himself only in relation to God, and can find his fulfilment only in God.

His failure to understand the human spirit in the total dimension of time and eternity leads him into dozens of obvious

falsifications of both the Christian religion and the human situation. In effect, what we have in his thought is a simple naturalistic opposition to the dualism of nature and supernature, of time and eternity. He rightly opposes the concept of a realm of supernature which has no relation to the historical process. But he fails to understand that there is a dialectical relation between eternity and history, that eternity is the transcendent meaning of history, without which there would be no meaningful history but merely a succession of events. His simple naturalism leads him into all of the basic errors, in assessing the human situation, which bourgeois liberalism and Marxism have made in the past two centuries; and his thought fails to escape the utopianism which has characterized this thought. Let us enumerate the errors.

1. He does not understand the problem of human sin. He declares:

> 'Dualism involves the view that there is a fundamental disparity between desire and what is morally right. For the religious consciousness (when MacMurray uses this term he means Hebraic or Biblical religion in contrast to mystical or rationalistic religion) such a conclusion is simply the *reductio ad absurdum* of dualism. The world is one. Human nature is one. For the religious consciousness the problem that arises is not "why do men not do what they ought to do" but "why do men not do what they want to do"? Why do we persist in refusing to be ourselves and fulfil our own nature?'

The problem of sin is something more than the 'shadow cast by our dualistic mode of thought.' Christianity rightly denies that evil is the inertia of matter operating against the universalities of mind. But the Christian nevertheless confesses 'The good that I would do, I do not do.' The tragedy of human existence is that man has the freedom to deny his essential nature, and is perpetually tempted to do so.

2. He does not understand the fact of human self-transcendence. He declares:

> 'When we define human nature in terms of its reflective moment, as in the Greek tradition, we define it as an isolated selfhood. But the religious consciousness defines it in terms of the reality of action and so cannot be individualistic.'

The element of truth in this statement is that mysticism does indeed abstract the moment of contemplation from its organic relation to the world of decision and action. It abstracts the ego from history and finally loses it in an undifferentiated eternity.

But it is ridiculous to claim that Christianity has no place for the 'reflective moment.' What is prayer? Unlike mysticism, Christianity demands, not the absorption of the soul in God, but the obedience of the creature's will to God's will; and God's will is defined as love. Contemplation can therefore not be an end in itself. Nevertheless there is no possible moral achievement, social situation or historical culmination which can satisfy the soul if it does not finally find itself in God. The dimension of the human spirit which escapes MacMurray is perfectly expressed in the words of Augustine:

> 'Therefore is the mind too strait to contain itself. And where should that be which it containeth not of itself? . . . I dive on this side and on that and there is no end. . . . And where shall I find Thee? If I find Thee without my memory then I do not retain Thee, and how shall I find Thee if I remember Thee not?'

It need hardly be emphasized that the capacity of the human spirit to stand outside of every situation in which it is organically involved makes it impossible to equate the Christian love commandment with the will to 'community.' Love must be realized in all the organic and even mechanical structures of human society, but it must also transcend them and make demands which cannot be realized in them. It follows that the Kingdom of God, the transcendent meaning of human history, can never appear as fully in history as MacMurray supposes.

3. This brings us naturally to the utopianism of MacMurray's thought. Utopianism is the inevitable weakness of naturalistic thought. For MacMurray the apocalyptic element in the Gospel simply means confidence in the ultimate triumph of God's will:

> 'It is the fundamental postulate of religious rationality that the purposes of God must inevitably be achieved.'

It is significant that there is nowhere in his thought a place for the centrality of the Cross in Christian faith; nor is there understanding for that aspect of history which is interpreted in the words of St. John: 'He came unto his own and his own received him not.' The self-defeat of evil is equated with the triumph of the good. The Marxian notion that the self-destruction of capitalism will lead to the achievement of a classless society, a kingdom of God on earth, is made into the principle of a Christian interpretation of history. But suppose that this new

classless society should disappoint our hopes? Professor MacMurray's passages on Russia prove that, like all utopians, he cannot allow himself to entertain the idea lest his whole sense of the meaning of history break down.

There is, in short, no thought of the possibility that human history may continue to the end to deny its own essence, that we may have realizations of meaning upon higher and higher levels but also denials of meaning upon those same levels; that human life is involved in a tragedy from which only the mercy of God can redeem it. The 'good news' of the Gospel is made to mean the discovery of the law of life as love. For St. Paul the good news was that this law, which was 'unto death' because the more clearly it was stated the more patently it was revealed that man did not live by it, had been overcome by a Divine mercy which finally took the contradictions of human existence into itself.

Christianity as an interpretation of history merely adds pious phrases to either the bourgeois idea of progress or the Marxian idea of redemption through catastrophe, if it does not comprehend human life in this depth. Prof. MacMurray has shifted the emphasis from the bourgeois to the Marxian interpretation. The merit of his position is the necessary appreciation of the sense of a meaningful and dynamic history which developed in modern culture, in both bourgeois liberalism and Marxism, in opposition to Christian other-worldliness. MacMurray is quite right in recognizing a truly Christian and Biblical element in this thought. But Biblical prophecy, culminating in the apocalyptic element in the Gospels, cannot be simply equated with these modern notions of a meaningful history. They contain a realization, which modernity lacks, that even the Creator of the world does not easily triumph over the evil of human history. The periodic self-destruction of evil is certainly no proof of His ultimate triumph; for the instruments of His judgments to-day may become the rebels against His will to-morrow, as the prophets knew full well.

It may be illuminating to mention a specific problem, the problem of race, in which MacMurray's utopianism betrays him into false judgments. After speaking with great profundity on the universalism of Hebrew prophecy and its culmination in the universalism of Jesus (an analysis which includes penetrating

observations upon Hitler's anti-Semitism as prompted by his own doctrine of a Messianic nation) MacMurray concludes that

> 'the only real community in which the Jewish problem can be solved would be a community of humanity in which race was no longer a principle of unity.'

Here we have the rationalistic-utopian idea of an undifferentiated community of humanity which resolves the frictions of smaller communities of loyalty by the simple expedient of eliminating them. The real problem of history is to transcend without destroying the organic forms of history. Fascist nationalism is in fact, on one side of it, a justified protest against a rationalistic universalism which thought it could eliminate the organic forms which nature introduces into history; which man as spirit can never accept uncritically, but which man as creature must nevertheless accept as his fate. Despite MacMurray's hatred of mystic and rationalistic forms of escape from the tensions of history, his solution of the Jewish problem is analogous to the mystic solution of the problem of egotism. The mystic overcomes egotism by annihilating the ego. MacMurray would overcome collective egotism by annihilating race and nation. Human history is really more complex than that.

The discussion thus far has been concerned with interpretations of the Christian religion; and the criticism could be summed up in the statement that Christian other-worldliness and supernaturalism needs to be challenged, but that a criticism informed by modern naturalism, whether bourgeois or Marxian, comes little nearer the truth of Christianity than the older Platonism and idealism. For Christian faith, human history is indeed meaningful but not simply so. Its source and end lie beyond itself; necessarily so, for the principle of interpretation of a process must transcend the process.

It may be relevant to say a further word about MacMurray's social analyses without reference to his religious presuppositions. These analyses are usually very astute and penetrating. But occasionally he is betrayed by his obsession with the evils of 'dualism' which he finds lurking behind every human action which seems to him to violate the law of life. We will let one example suffice. He believes that aristocracies have one ambition: to escape from work. 'The individualist struggle for

freedom is a struggle to escape from work. This is, of course, the formal will of every ruling class,' he declares. The motive of leisure is even, quite erroneously, ascribed to Plato's philosopher-king.

Bertrand Russell is much nearer the truth in his assertion that what men seek primarily is power and glory. An oligarchy or aristocracy seeks above all to unify social life around it upon the basis of its will. It desires power and prestige. Leisure and the life of contemplation is quite secondary. Sometimes it is desired as a badge of power; sometimes, in periods of decadence, it is desired for its own sake. The womenfolk of the aristocrats may seek leisure, and the powerful menfolk may use their women's leisure as an advertisement of their eminent position in society. But the sin of the oligarch simply does not fit into MacMurray's nice formula of a dualism between thought and action, contemplation and decision.

There are of course aristocratic contemplatives and ascetics in every society. But their purpose is to escape the contest of power which seems to them the very essence of society. They may express an uneasy conscience parasitically; but they have little in common with the real oligarchs of society who both create and destroy societies by the ruthlessness of their will. Professor MacMurray's analyses of these matters would profit by a study of Thorstain Veblen's classic, *Theory of the Leisure Class*.

This review has become more critical than was intended. It would be unfortunate if any criticism, however rigorous, should dissuade anyone from reading a book which must prove rewarding to every thoughtful reader. MacMurray's mind is extraordinarily fecund, and he throws new light upon many perennial problems of religion and social life.

THE SPIRIT-BEARING CHURCH

By The Editor.

SOME thirty years ago I was engaged with F. L. Pogson, Casberd Scholar of St. John's, Oxford, in bringing out an English edition of Harnack's *Constitution and Law of the Church* when I came across, for the first time, a rare Greek word *pneumatophoros*. The word means, in accordance with the way in which it is accented, either Spirit-borne or Spirit-bearing. Harnack took the view that it meant Spirit-bearing and translated it *Geistträger*, thus bringing it into line with such words as *Christophorus*, the name given to the giant who carried the Christ child across the ford, and *Theophorus*, the surname of Ignatius. *Pneumatophoros* appears from the Lexicons to have been used only by ecclesiastical writers in the first four centuries A.D. The word also occurs twice in the Septuagint and Greek versions of the Old Testament (*Hosea* ix. 7: *Zeph.* iii. 4), and is there applied to prophets.

As I reflected on this word 'Spirit-bearing,' it seemed to me to be the most significant designation which could be given to the Christian Church*—more significant than the familiar designations One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, enshrined in our Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. Each of these designations has its significance and value and they are very ancient. 'Holy' takes us back to the first mention of the Church in the Creeds ('I believe in Holy Church'). 'Catholic' takes us back to St. Ignatius, the second Bishop of Antioch, martyred about 112 A.D. ('Where Christ is, there is the Catholic Church,' wrote that saint). 'Apostolic' we owe to St. Irenaeus, in the last quarter of the second century. 'One' is the earliest of all the titles ('There is one body and one Spirit. . . . one hope of your calling: one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all,' wrote St. Paul to the Ephesians).

* This view which I believed to be original had been, so a friend has pointed out to me, anticipated by that great Patristic scholar Bishop Gore. In his Bampton Lectures delivered in 1891 Dr. Gore there uses the phrase 'Spirit-bearing Church.'

But none of these designations is as profound and significant as 'Spirit-bearing.' As I studied it, and in the light of it the New Testament's presentation of the Church, it altered my conception of the Church as radically as listening to Sir Oliver Lodge's Romanes Lecture on the electrical theory of matter altered my whole conception of matter derived from the theories and experiments of the older physicists.

The designation Spirit-bearing does not deny that the Church is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, but it transforms and vitalises the whole conception of the Church, even as an electrical theory of matter transforms and vitalises our whole conception of matter. The hard, static, rigid, mechanistic conception of the Church which was presented in our dogmatic textbooks had not been exploded, but had become sublimated or subsumed under a higher conception. Like the actors in the masque in 'The Tempest,' the mundane had become transformed into the ethereal :

> 'These our actors,
> as I foretold you, were all spirits.'

It became clear that the profoundest and truest way of viewing the Christian Church was as the organ of the Divine Spirit —the Spirit of Christ. When I turned to the New Testament it was equally clear that this was the most primitive and fundamental conception of the Church. It was the conviction of our earliest Church historian, St. Luke. Our earliest Church history, the *Acts of the Apostles*, opens with two striking scenes — like the drop-scenes in Victorian theatres — dramatic and symbolic rather than strictly historical.

The first scene shews us Jesus parting from His disciples, blessing them as He ascends into Heaven, having first bidden them to tarry in Jerusalem until they shall be endued with power from on high.

The second scene exhibits the descent of the Spirit in the form of fiery tongues lighting on each apostolic head, thus giving the Apostles fervent zeal to preach the Gospel unto all nations—granting them, in exchange for the physical presence of Christ, the inspiration and vital force of His Eternal Spirit.

In this second scene we witness the creation of the Christian Church by the action of the Creative Spirit. Rightly has Pente-

cost been named the Church's birthday. The rest of the *Acts* is a history, not only of the activities of the Christian Church, but also of the creative and inspiring power of the Holy Spirit. Both are ideally presented as parallel. Church institutions, Church extensions are the Spirit's work as well as the work of the primitive Apostles. The Apostles in issuing the decisions of their first Apostolic Council could dare to write: 'For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us' (*Acts* xv, 28). The writer of the Fourth Gospel could write of the Risen and Ascended Jesus in relation to the Apostles: 'He breathed on them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.' And St. Paul could write to his Corinthian converts:

> 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit . . . the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom: to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit: to another faith by the same Spirit: to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit: to another the working of miracles: to another prophecy: to another discerning of spirits: to another divers kinds of tongues: to another the interpretation of tongues. But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.'

All the gifts and graces of the Christian Church are due to the operation of the Holy Spirit. These impartations of the Spirit to the Church's members are called *charismata* in the New Testament. Later writers have divided them into extraordinary and ordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit. The 'extraordinary' are speaking with tongues, the interpretation of tongues, gifts of healing, etc. The 'ordinary' are the Christian virtues. For St. Paul, however, the latter were the more excellent gifts, and the former were gratifying but troublesome spiritual manifestations which required to be kept under strict control.

These citations from the New Testament — and very many more could be given — are sufficient to justify the giving of the title Spirit-bearing to the Church, and I cannot but think that it might have made the greatest difference to the Church's history if that title had become the chief, or even the sole, designation of the Church of Christ.

Why that designation did not become popular in Church circles is easily understood in the light of Church History. Montanism, or 'the New Prophecy,' arose in the second cen-

tury. Its fanaticism, intolerance and undisciplined zeal alarmed the more conservative members of the Church, particularly its rulers. As a consequence, the ministries of the Spirit were viewed with apprehension, and in no long time the ever-present inspiration and guidance of the Spirit was exchanged for what was believed to be the security and soundness of apostolic tradition and the written Word. During the period of transition monarchical bishops, like Polycarp, subsumed the gift of prophecy and claimed that they themselves were prophets — but prophecy quickly withered in this climate.

With the suppression or expulsion of the ministries of the Spirit, a change came over the temper of Church life. Conservative, legalist, traditionalist, materialist tendencies became more and more powerful, and as a consequence freedom, initiative, flexibility, powers of adaptation were severely restricted. In time the Church appeared to be bound hand and foot by inherited traditions, inherited customs, inherited dogmas, inherited institutions. To criticise these and to depart from them was accounted a sure sign of heretical and sectarian tendencies which must be condemned and extirpated. As time went on ecclesiastical authority became identified with the most burdensome tyranny, so that St. Augustine wrote in a well-known passage cited by the Reformers that the estate of Christian people had in this respect become worse than that of the Jews, and the free action of the Spirit was no longer hoped for or desired in the Church's life. The Spirit Himself was restricted in His operations to the use of ecclesiastical machinery. He operated through the channels of sacramental grace and institutions. The conception of sacramental grace, as the supreme endowment of the Christian Church, replaced belief in the inspiration, power and creative activity of the Holy Spirit as the Church's most precious possession.

I cannot but think when we view the state of the Church today and prescribe remedies for its declining vitality, ranging from 'stunts and stumps' to 'moral and spiritual re-armament,' that what is really primarily needful if the Church is to recover its vitality, is that it should recognize first and foremost that it is a Spirit-bearing Body. With that recognition we should begin to recover the right scale of Christian values in which the gifts

of the Spirit—Faith which is opposed to all materialism; Hope to all pessimism; Freedom to all tyranny; Truth to all falsehood; Courage to all cowardice—would be held to be the most precious possession of the Christian Church: its Master gifts. Scriptures, creeds, traditions, customs, institutions would then all be regarded as subject to the Spirit, to be used or rejected, curtailed or developed, replaced or retained, just in so far as they served the aim and mission of the Spirit-bearing Church.

Until our Church's rulers and our Church's reformers return to this valuation and policy there seems to be no hope for the Church as the saviour of mankind. Archbishop William Temple said on one occasion, 'The Bishops are the organs of the Holy Ghost or they are nothing.' This is true also of the humblest member of the Christian Church. But the implications of these affirmations need to be implemented in our Church's life and policy. If that be done, and when it is done, we shall find that our Church, or any portion of it which loyally realizes this ideal, will more than recover any influence for good which it may have lost.

THE TEACHER'S TASK*

By Canon R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.

YOU are met together once again 'to link the times which were with those which are.' These words, which caught my eye when I saw your Year Book, will serve as my text this morning. They have that ring—that moving quality—that belongs to phrases which we recognize instinctively as having sprung from the wells of life and mean more than is at first apparent. These particular words mean more than maintaining a connection with your *alma mater*. That connection, of course, is itself a precious thing. To renew the associations and wake the memories of one's youth melts our hardening, and fructifies our perhaps disheartened, natures; and—in Francis Thompson's words—

> 'makes the sudden lilies push
> between the loosening fibres of the heart.'

*An address given at the Annual Reunion of the Teachers' Training College of S. Mark and S. John, Chelsea.

But this is the personal and comforting sense of the words. They have also one that affects your charge and your calling; sterner perhaps, yet no less inspiring.

How are things going in the world of childhood and adolescence to-day? Is there a genuine development, or only a whirring of the wheels? One of the main purposes of a gathering like this is a fresh dedication of yourselves to the task of keeping education in the mainstream of its development; and in this way, too, to link the times which were with those that are.

When we sit back and take stock of the situation, I do not suppose that any of us can be satisfied. It is possible, of course, to be wrapped up in one's own work; to be enthusiastic about it; and, perhaps, in the full tide of our energies, to feel no serious misgivings. But times of real weariness and disillusionment are common to most of us — especially as we grow older; feelings (which have nothing to do with our health, but with our growth in insight) that our energies have been poured into the sand, that we have only been cogs in an educational machine instead of living partners in an organic system; and that neither our life nor our work has the abiding worth to justify our endless efforts. Most of all, we look at the way the so-called civilized world is going (even in England): the weakness of ideals; the tendency to shallowness; the incapacity of many to think deeply or consecutively; and remembering that all have been to school — whatever other influences they lack — we feel, when such moods are upon us, that modern education stands condemned. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' That is a divine standard of judgment; to be applied to the sphere of education as to every other sphere.

Well — in a phrase of Thomas Hardy's — 'if a way to the better there be, it exacts a good look at the worst.' But there are hopeful things to take account of too. This is an age on which the ends of the world are come. An old order is passing; a new one is still but struggling to be born. And *we* are having to bear the burdens of such a time. Much effort has had to go in useless experiment; we have had to try things out for others, in years when all the old landmarks have been swept away and we have had to guide the ship by stormy skies. Our problems and despairs — in England — must of course be nothing com-

pared with those of men of our calling on the Continent, who have seen the swirling waters sweep everything to the cataracts, and all they lived for perish. For them, hope must be cast into a more distant future. But idealists in this country are not bereft of present hope; and if the existing — which is also the last — world-crisis for our own times can be tided over, we shall feel that, after all, our day's work will have large results. We shall have linked the times that were, not only with those that are, but also with those that are to be. For such a prize, we may count it a light thing to have suffered darkness now, to have been in fact, in our own appointed way, partakers in the Cross.

As Christians, too, we turn from the Cross to the Resurrection. So also let us turn from the past to the future; to the new order which is being born. We shall do well to recall those lines of Wordsworth, written in 1804, as he looked back on the French Revolution:

> 'Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
> But to be young was very Heaven.'

It takes a lot of faith to say that just now; but let us say it until all grounds for present hope are gone. To think it, and to say it, may even be the one thing needful to hasten the dawn into the day. But let us be quite clear that the coming day will not be another yesterday. The old order cannot return. The sun will shine, but it will not be with the same sunshine — though it will be the same sun; which is a parable of what matters most: to wit, the future relations of education and religion.

The vast changes at hand are widely sensed but not clearly perceived. In the sphere of religion few people realize even how vast they must be. Belief in God, of course, will once more become dominant (the same Sun will shine again), but the completely new view of the universe which we have reached is an indication of how far we must revise our ideas about its Creator. It is largely the persistence in the Churches of the old, anthropomorphic views of God and of His miraculous activities—childish conceptions—which by reaction make it attractive to so many to-day to play with the notion that there is no God, and that Matter is the one self-existent reality, Mind only being Matter in the highest degree of organization. But such a view leaves the nature of Matter undefined and the cause of diversity un-

explained. The existence of God is the only satisfactory answer to the problem of the Great Original. But we must understand Him in relation to all that Science has to teach us. Our thoughts of Him grow immeasurably thereby; and no truth, however strange, can lead us away from Him.

In the same way our view of Man is changed. The idea of Man as shaped directly by the hand of God; and of Man's fall; and of the sending of the Christ down from heaven to save Man from God's wrath — all these belong to the mythology of religion. Great religious truths are enshrined in this mythology, but they need to be restated. It has become apparent that just as belief in God is the first fundamental of religion, so the second is belief in Man. Modern education, we may note, proceeds on the assumption of Man's inestimable value; but it does not treat this as a religious belief, and the tenet seems often out of harmony with the religion directly taught in our schools. Yet it was the genius of Christ to perceive it and the existence of Jesus that showed it; and on it — together with belief in God — the Christianity of the future must be built up.

Similarly, with regard to God's influence upon Man. God influences man by Grace; which used to be thought of as the direct impact of omnipotence. But, as Dr. Oman has said, a faith which works with this direct idea of God's omnipotence, in a world in which God seems so sparing of good and so tolerant of evil, is locked in a death-struggle with the fear that either God cannot help or does not care. We must think of Grace now as God's own spiritual Presence within our souls; not overmastering, but calling and drawing and empowering us; not over against our true nature and will, but bringing them to victory over the dross and evil that would destroy them.

The change here is fundamental; and if the experience of ourselves must needs still make us cry to God for salvation, our cry is to a Father, who judges not by a taskmaster's rule, but only by the contrast of His unutterable perfection. Our faith in His omnipotence has changed not lessened: because He made us in His image, spiritual beings, we have the freedom even to resist His love; and to our sins and negligences, to our fears and blindnesses, are due the miseries that we used formerly to lay at His door.

On such great themes it is not possible for me to speak fully this morning. I mention them; first, because they are fundamental; secondly, to indicate how vast will be the changes in religion — between which you will, I hope, make links: changes far more radical than are anticipated in the petty criticisms of the Church which are all that most of the laity can make; and thirdly, because the net result of these changes in religion has a direct bearing on education.

If I may liken God to the great wide ocean, we ourselves are the little lochs of human personality and there is access from the One to the other. Thus our souls may have something of the freshening and surging power of the ocean as well as the quiet peace of sheltered waters. But there is no fundamental separation between God and man. That is the point. Reality is for us not simply God, but God-and-man. 'The Kingdom of Heaven is within you' was our Lord's matchless way of putting it — so little understood.

And does not Education, in like manner, place human perfection in an internal condition? As Matthew Arnold, that great educationalist, said: It is in making endless additions to itself; in the endless expansion of its powers and in endless growth in wisdom and beauty, that the spirit of the human race finds its ideal; and to reach this ideal, education is an indispensable aid — wherein it coincides with religion. In other words, not only must education be religious, but religion must be educational. We hear much about the first, but little about the second. Teachers can help towards both.

Only by such conceptions as these, properly worked out and applied, will the new stage in the evolution of mankind be brought about. And I have thought it best to draw your attention to them — to launch out into the deep — rather than to dwell on the more practical points of your calling or on matters which concern you only as members of this college. But do not forget that with your combined membership you must have some forty to fifty thousand children under your guidance, and in this way you can have a really determining influence on the next stage in man's evolution.

I believe that it is sometimes boasted that our age is highly distinguished above others because in it the schoolmaster is

abroad! Let him, however, never forget reverence—in the widest sense of the word—which is one of the distinguishing marks of the really educated. The schoolmaster can so easily become the friend of mere talent, tending to overlay clear personal insight with information left to remain as an extraneous, unassimilated burden. But the teacher's proper task should also be the preacher's task, namely, to turn knowledge into living vision and wisdom. As St. Bernard said:

> 'Those there are who desire to know, that they may know; and this bears the taint of curiosity;
> And those there are who desire to know, that they may be known; and theirs is the shame of vanity.
> And those there are who desire to know, that they may sell their knowledge, for money or for honours; and that is a shameful trade.
> And those there are who desire to know, that they may be built up; and this is wisdom.'

The preacher's task is to put all the wisdom of the ages, and all his personal experience and convictions, at the service of the stream of divine life that surges through the world like the tree's sap in spring, to be renewed perpetually in nature; rising from the ancient earth up to the tenderest leaves of the high branches, and linking thus the immovable and almost changeless with the ever-changing and renewing life of each passing day.

May it be your blessing to kindle your vision in this Reunion; to go back to your tasks with an enlarged insight into God's great plan for mankind; that so you may link together the times which were with those which are, and with those also which are to be.

BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGIOUS CONGRESSES*

There are various methods of reporting the proceedings of conferences. There is that followed in the Conference number of the *Modern Churchman*, which reproduces the papers read, but gives no details of the actual conduct of the Conference. A modified form of this method is supplied by the first of the reports here reviewed, which gives the chairman's opening

* *The World's Need of Religion*, being the Proceedings of the World Congress of Faiths, Oxford, 1937. (Ivor Nicholson and Watson. 1937. 5/-.)
The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh, 1937. Edited by Leonard Hodgson. (S.C.M. Press. 1938. 10/6.)

remarks, the main speaker's address, and a summary of the subsequent discussion. The result is a small book of less than two hundred pages, a number of which the publisher has seen fit to leave blank. The Edinburgh Conference is reported in much greater detail in some four hundred pages, of which a large number, like the less frequented parts of the Prayer Book, and presumably for the same reason, are printed in illegible type. The report gives ample information how the Conference was run, and is not content with publishing results. It is possible that some readers may be interested in such details as this: 'Only delegates appointed to represent their churches were full members of the Conference and entitled to take part in its decisions. Such members wore pink badges. Members of the Lausanne Continuation Committee and of the preparatory commissions, who had not received such fresh authorisation, wore green badges. Alternates, members of the Youth Group, and a few special visitors wore yellow badges. Blue badges were worn by other visitors.' There results an expensive book, which the judicious reader will skip. Or he may prefer to read Mr. Hugh Martin's 'Edinburgh, 1937,' which costs only two shillings and gives a sufficient account for all except those profoundly interested in the re-union problem. The Edinburgh Conference was limited to 'all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour.' This formula had the effect of admitting the Quakers, who are comparatively orthodox, but defective in order and sacraments, and of excluding the Unitarians, whose constitution is the same as that possessed by most Protestant churches, but whose orthodoxy is to seek. To hear a Unitarian voice we have to turn to the first of our books.

The object of the Congress is stated to be

> 'to promote a spirit of fellowship among mankind through religion. The movement seeks to awaken and develop a world-loyalty, while allowing full play for the diversity of men, nations and faiths.'

At Oxford, then, the Congress met and amicably agreed to differ. No one was to be persuaded to abandon anything he valued nor to accept anything he disliked. At Edinburgh the Conference, representing most Christian bodies except the Unitarians and the Roman Catholics (the latter self-excluded), sought to discuss differences of belief and organisation with a view to overcoming them. The Oxford Congress report would have been more useful had it consisted of a series of papers on the different world religions, written by experts. Unfortunately many of the speakers revealed themselves as more earnest than informed, and the inclusive charity of the Congress was so tolerant as to allow a young communist to explain why he had no use for religion. What the Congress could sink to may be illustrated by an extract from a Burmese speaker (p. 8):

> 'The beautiful land of Burma, the land of golden pagodas, has enjoyed the Buddhist religion for more than a thousand years; and

to-day the Burmese people love their religion and live according to its noble precepts. The wonderful literature and the beautiful art of Burma have all been inspired by the teaching which Buddha gave to the world some two thousand years ago. The happiness of the Burmese people and the freedom of the Burmese women, a freedom unique in the history of the world, show the excellence of their faith. To-day the Burmese people are the happiest and the Burmese women are the freest on the face of the earth.'

This may serve to remind us of the worst efforts of injudicious advocates of Christianity. Possibly there is a place somewhere for this kind of writing, but scarcely at a serious conference.

To Modernists the most interesting paper would be that contributed by Professor Ernesto Buonaiuti, the last of the Roman Catholic Modernists: he was condemned only in 1924. The anti-intellectualist character of this movement is clearly revealed in the writer's words (pp. 126-7):

'It may be said that the positive faiths, the established religions, betray their proper nature when they try to formulate, accurately and exhaustively, just what is ineffable and incapable of formulation, that original direct apprehension. Of this truth we have a striking example in the history of the most imposing branch of Christianity, the Roman Catholic Church. For centuries and centuries the Christian Church knew nothing of any theoretical proof of the existence of God. From the New Testament writings, in which faith in the Father and His righteousness is an unchallenged assumption, through the patristic literature down to Carolingian times, the Christian faith was an intense and living experience which did not concern itself to prove the existence of God with syllogism and category. It may be said that the first proof, technically conceived and outlined, of the existence of God was that attempted by St. Anselm, with his ontological argument. The scholastic philosophy replaced the *a priori* method with the *a posteriori* method derived from Aristotle, with its proofs derived from conceptions of motions and cause. But we might say that, while St. Anselm thought out his arguments with a view to putting an imaginary unbeliever in the wrong, unbelief and atheism actually made their appearance in the world of Christian thought at the moment when the Thomistic philosophy believed it was basing an incontrovertible proof of the existence of God upon dialectical processes, supposed to have the coercive force of a mathematical theorem. The case is a highly enlightening one. Faith cannot be the result of a syllogism, and, if we want to make our faith in the divine depend on a dialectical process, we deform the act of faith and we profane that conception of the sacred reality before which our hearts would, and should, lie prostrate. We must not forget that Aristotle set forth with his notions of cause, of potentiality, and of act only to arrive at the assertion of a motionless prime mover whose essential quality is that of being impassive and perfect in himself, and of being able, as he says, to do without any friend whatever.

'The great historical religions, on the other hand, have conceived God as the Father, the great Provider, who watches over His children and suffers whenever we wander away from Him, and whose heart is wrung as often as we make shipwreck of our lives.

'Our spiritual asphyxia began on the day when we tried to turn faith into a mechanical argument, our religious sense into an arithmetical calculation.

'Nor need we imagine that if we restore faith to that prelogical, predialectical stage which is its specific domain, we are in danger of impoverishing the fulness of our spiritual life. There are many realities in the world of which philosophy knows nothing, and there are, hidden away in the recesses of our consciousness, capacities for apprehending the sacred reality outside ourselves that have nothing to do with our proclivity for syllogistic argument.

'On the contrary. An exaggerated development of the reasoning powers of an individual, or of a group, always takes place to the detriment of a full, healthy, complete life of the spirit, because, as Bergson has shown so beautifully in his *Evolution Créatrice*, pure intelligence always causes arrest and paralysis in the upward thrust of the *élan vital*, and every time, in the life of an individual or in the history of a society, that the laws of life demand a renewal of efficiency, it is precisely to all the extra-logical regions of the spirit that recourse must be made. Is not faith essentially, in its own living, organic dialectic, just a direct apprehension of, and contact with, the central, mystery-shrouded nucleus of life?'

The tone of the Edinburgh Report bears a curious resemblance to that of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine, due no doubt to the presidency of the Archbishop of York in both cases.

The Edinburgh Conference was a successor to that held at Lausanne in 1927, which was based on four fundamental principles:

'1. Its main work is to draw churches out of isolation into conference, in which none is to be asked to be disloyal to or to compromise its convictions, but to seek to explain them to others while seeking to understand their points of view. Irreconcilable differences are to be recorded as honestly as agreements;

'2. Conferences are to be conferences of delegates officially appointed by the churches to represent them;

'3. Invitations to take part in these conferences are to be issued to "all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour";

'4. Only churches themselves are competent to take actual steps towards reunion by entering into negotiations with one another. The work of the movement is not to formulate schemes and tell the churches what they ought to do, but to act as the handmaid of the churches in the preparatory work of clearing away misunderstandings, discussing obstacles to reunion, and issuing reports which are submitted to the churches for their approval' (p. 3).

An interesting section summarises the progress of reunion schemes since the Lausanne Conference:

'The specific unions or approaches to union which the decade has witnessed have sometimes concerned Churches in different nations, as, for example, those between the Anglican Communion on the one side and the Old Catholic Churches of Europe and the Churches of the

Orthodox Communion on the other; but they have generally been confined to Churches within their several nations. A special complication has been experienced in connection with the mutual approaches among the younger Churches, particularly in the Orient and in Africa, the control of which rests partially with parent Churches in the older Christian lands.

'The total number of active unity movements is impressive. Nearly half of them have occurred in North America — a fact which reflects the exceptionally large number of previous divisions needing to be healed. And nearly as many are to be found in Asia as in Europe — a fact to be explained in part by the immense pressure of non-Christian civilisations which forces the Churches together, and in part by the practical necessities of the situation. The majority of the achieved unions have thus occurred between churches not previously sundered by the profounder differences of theological or cultural tradition; so that, in the main, unity has as yet been fully reached only in the easier situations.

'Moreover, the group of movements towards unity which marks the period represents very different stages of progress. Some have only reached the stage of vague or tentative exploration. Others have gone as far as definite negotiations regarding terms and conditions of union. Still others, as in the recent conversations between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland and the associated Churches in both countries, have suffered indefinite postponement. Some have even had to be abandoned. A somewhat larger number has been consummated. It is a matter for great satisfaction to be able to record that all unions which have been in existence long enough to be tested have been distinctly successful in the eyes of those primarily concerned.

'The schemes attempted illustrate all the usual meanings of the word unity. Some schemes have sought and some have secured mutual recognition between Churches, and thus have laid the basis for intercommunion. As an example we may quote the agreement establishing full intercommunion between the Churches of the Anglican Communion and the Old Catholic Churches. An agreement has happily been reached and ratified between the Church of England and the Church of Finland, and negotiations are in progress with the Churches of Latvia and Esthonia. Other Churches have been content with more or less complete federation. About three-quarters of all the cases recorded, however, have contemplated the actual corporate union of two or more previously separate bodies. This is exemplified in such conspicuous instances as the reunion of the Scottish Presbyterian Churches in 1929 and that of the English Methodists in 1932, as the union of the three Churches in Canada in 1925, as the formation of the Church of Christ in China in 1927 combining Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, Presbyterian and Reformed Churches, United Brethren, the United Church of Canada and independent Chinese Churches founded by six English-speaking nations. There are to be borne in mind also the contemplated unions of the French Reformed Churches and of the chief Methodist Churches of the United States. All these cases significantly change former ecclesiastical structure and constitute single Churches.

'Many of the great denominational types of Churches represented in the Faith and Order Movement have been involved in these recent developments. Some have been primarily interested in the realisation

of a particular form or kind of unity. Others have limited themselves to the uniting of bodies of the same religious type and tradition. But highly significant unions in the United States, Canada and China have brought into single communions Churches of very different traditions and polity; so that the record of the immediate past does not suggest any necessity for waiting upon unions of denominational families before wider union is attempted.

'Obviously, any estimate of the very varied forms of mutual approach depends upon the kind of unity one believes to be important and on the true objective. Schemes of a denominational kind might in some cases prove in a few years' time to have strengthened confessional consciousness and so to have postponed oecumenical union by widening the gulfs between the large Churches thus created. Some may see in most of the recent movements only minor cases mainly remedying, on a local or regional scale, certain practical disadvantages of disunion. Intercommunion has not been widely extended during the decade; and no union has been consummated between a Church of radically "Catholic" and one of radically "Evangelical" tradition. While, then, the significance of the progress made must not be overstated, the trend towards unity is nevertheless marked both in magnitude and in character. It is widespread throughout the world. It occurs in a wide variety of forms. It is vital, relevant to actual situations. It is making increasing appeal to the heart and conscience of all Christian men' (pp. 221-3).

The actual report consists of six terse chapters on the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Church of Christ and the Word of God, the Communion of Saints, the Church of Christ, Ministry and Sacraments, the Church's Union in Life and Worship. Broadly speaking, it may be said that on the doctrinal side the Lutheran standpoint is stressed; on the constitutional side, the Anglican. In Germany at least the Reformation disputes are not dead, though it is a little difficult to decide if 'the apparent antithesis of God's sovereignty and man's responsibility' (p. 225) is to be interpreted optimistically of the seeming antithesis or despairingly of the obvious antithesis. The Lutheran conception of the Word of God is barely intelligible to anyone brought up outside that communion and seems based upon a confusion of the Logos with the written words of Scripture, together with an attempt to ascribe a kind of sacramental value to preaching.

These chapters give a clear and brief account of the intellectual differences of the various Christian bodies; on pp. 275-6 a vague and sentimental affirmation of union in allegiance to our Lord Jesus Christ is printed, which resembles the kind of statement issued after an unsuccessful diplomatic conference, by which each participant desires to assure the world that the time has not been entirely wasted.

Before dissolving, the Conference recommended the constitution of a World Council of Churches for further discussion.

If the Edinburgh Conference appears to have treated the topic of reunion in the fashion associated with the Assembly of the League of Nations,

it will appear that the failure is due to the same reason; each church guards jealously its own sovereignty. In spite of the obvious will to reunion and the great efforts made towards attaining it, the result resembles two men who have chained themselves to railings on opposite sides of the road, and then strain at them, affirming all the time their desire to meet. Until the churches are ready to abandon their concern for dogmatic precision and constitutional correctness and to treat everything as provisional and, if necessary, to be discarded, the reconstruction of Christendom is improbable.

P. R. Smythe.

THE BIRTH PANGS OF THE KINGDOM *

The distinguished mark of the theology of the last few years is its strong sociological content. It has passed out of the stage in which doctrinal discussion could take place against a background upon which there was a fairly general agreement. Events have rushed forward. The Russian Revolution actualized Marxism and presented Christianity with a formidable rival ideology. During the last decade, many in this country have recovered from the depression symbolized twenty years ago in the worship of Freud and have found in Marx a new prophet of salvation. The pressure of economic causes and the upheaval of post-war Europe begat the philosophy of Fascism with its Gospel of Race and Soil. In Italy and in Germany, an aggressive nationalism has become a menace to liberty and has cancelled the rights of the individual in order to enthrone those of the state. Hegel had indeed come into his own. Not only was he perpetuated in the Marxist philosophy of dialecticism, which would produce inevitably the 'classless state' but, through Neitzsche, he was invoked to give his benediction to the State-Worship of modern Germany. Among upholders of the older forms of political theory, events have had their effect. Toryism has embarked upon policies of social reform and service which have led some of its industrialist members very near indeed to National Socialism. Liberalism is in its death-throes. The values for which it stood cease to be acknowledged. It stands too distinctively for the characteristic nineteenth-century virtues, suited to a period when Britain was at the peak of its industrial and commercial prosperity but ill-adapted to deal with the new situation.

The books under review illustrate the various remarks that have been made. Mr. Johnston is a modern Tory. He supports the National Government and he urges the case for social progress. His attractive little pamphlet makes some good points but it fails to grapple with the most

* *Crisis for Christianity.* By Wm. Teeling. (Gifford. 10/6. 1939.)
Community in Britain. (Community Service Committee. 2/-. 1938.)
Social Progress. By A. C. Johnston. (Faber & Faber. 1/-. 1938.)
Prophets and Priests. By S. H. Hooke.
Plato's Republic. By T. M. Knox.
Totalitarianism. By J. C. Hardwick. Interpreter Series. Thos. Murby & Co. 1/- a volume. 1938.)

serious question of all, that of the salvation of modern man. Certainly, he cannot be saved by social progress. The situation is too complex. It is difficult to establish a permanent progress in an age of unrest and of decay. The issues are deeper than Mr. Johnston supposes. It is not a case of better houses or of more education. Mr. Hardwick goes to the root of the matter when he sees the present age as one in which the economic system of capitalism is in decline. The capitalist world is falling to pieces and the vital question is whether peace and security can be established in some manner which shall rescue such values as have not been wiped away from memory. Mr. Hardwick is clearly correct when he reminds his readers that Communism, which has as its aim an economic freedom for all, is logical whilst capitalism, which spells poverty for the majority in a world of plenty, is the very reverse. He is insistent that both Communism and Fascism are 'religious,' for both are totalitarian in their demands upon man and both go to the roots of his being. Both are opposed fundamentally to the liberty of the individual. Their interest lies in the 'group.'

> 'Stress on the individual, and desire for the growth instead of the suppression of individuality, is *not* inconsistent with co-operative activity.'

Mr. Hardwick here has his finger upon the root of the matter so far as the distinctive Christian claims are concerned. It is this which leads him to deplore the sociological implications of Platonism and their effects upon Christianity. (A useful summary of Plato's Republic for the Greekless is contained in the little book of Professor Knox.) It likewise underlies the descriptions of various attempts at co-operation which are contained in the collection of papers, 'Community in Britain.' It is impossible to give a synopsis of this book. The papers were written from many vastly different angles. We were especially interested in the describing of a Franciscan attempt at an order of preachers by the Rev. C. C. Stimson and by the description of the semi-religious order, 'The Order of The Church Militant' (formerly The Catholic Crusade), which exists to perpetuate the work of the Rev. Conrad Noel. There is also a most interesting paper by Mr. Middleton Murry. One general thesis emerges. Driven into a rooted opposition to the present economic system and feeling that reconstruction can only take place by means of a withdrawal from it, many groups of people, inspired by such causes as Christianity, Theosophy, or the Homecraft movement, are seeking to build up community groups which are dedicated to the construction of a better world.

The churches are largely identified with the world-as-it-is. They are caught-up into the disintegrating process which that world is undergoing. The whole problem of church and state has passed over into an entirely new phase. The classic arguments for ecclesiastical establishments used by Lord Selborne, Mr. Gladstone, or Dean Stanley, have no real application

in a world in which a large percentage of the population have abandoned the pretence of accepting Christian theology and have turned instead to the promises of salvation proclaimed by Stalin or Herr Rosenberg. The part played by the Roman Catholic Church in Germany is well outlined by Mr. Teeling, although at times his arguments need checking by those of another Roman Catholic author, Dr. Waldemar Gurian. He describes the conflict produced by the clash of two rival claims to the whole-hearted allegiance of the populace, the Catholic and the Nazi. In an interesting chapter upon the attitude of the Roman Church to temporal states, Mr. Teeling points out that it is not one of such close intimacy as is often supposed, justifying his conclusions by references to the *Quadragesimo Anno* of Pius XI. He remarks that the Church was willing to go as far as is humanly possible to meet the Nazis and to come to terms. In this one remark, Mr. Teeling has exposed the whole weakness of Mediaeval conceptions of the Church and the reason why they could not combat the commercial individualism of John Calvin. They are lacking in their conception of the Kingdom of God, a far more important weakness than that suggested by old-fashioned Protestant arguments. Having fallen into the Augustinian apostasy in Christian sociology and identified the Church with the Kingdom, they then reduce the Kingdom to the standard and method of the kingdoms of this world and jostle with them on their own terms. Therein lay the weakness of Mediaeval Catholic sociology. It failed against Calvin. There are reasons for thinking that it will likewise fail against Hitler. Incidentally, Mr. Teeling gives the best popular account available of the attempted Catholic Social State in Austria.

The impression which may be gleaned is that the world is in a state of disorder and of disintegrating so far as its civilization is concerned. This is true. A glance at the several books suggests that the conflicting cultures represent the inward side of the conflict of outward civilizations, a sure sign of disintegration. But the question must further arise as to the part to be played by Christianity. It has no right to identify itself with any one theory of secular politics but it stands for the solidarity of the human race, the race as 'fallen' and yet as being redeemed, the vision of the Kingdom of God, a co-operative activity in which the individual is guaranteed a personal growth, a definite relation of revelation between God and mankind which presupposes some sort of relationship between church and state. All of these elements are contained within Christianity. The question is whether a Christian social message can be abstracted from them. Reinhold Niebuhr denounces the priest's ministrations of comfort and claims that such a message is purely one of prophecy, the preaching of the Gospel. Some Catholics desert the prophet for the priest. Some Protestants are either next-worldly individualists, divorced from the categories of Biblical religion, or else demand a personal conversion of individuals, a very true

claim but only a part of the whole process. It is to the merit of Professor Hooke's little book that he shows the place both of priest and of prophet in the history of religion and stresses the need of both that religion may be perpetuated. In view of the origins of social orders, his sketch of the ritual-pattern in religious cults is highly important.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright.

THE HISTORY OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN JAPAN*

This volume of the Hale Lectures carries the weight of its author who, now Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in America, gave his younger years of vigour to the Church in Japan, and in addition to his other intellectual qualifications was expert in the Japanese language. The work is not likely to contain errors in fact, or in judgment on facts where expressed. It is a consecutive series of lectures, a well classified chronicle of events, not written primarily with literary aim. But it is readable and of general interest, though its distinctive interest is naturally for American Churchmen. The American share in building the Church of our communion in Japan is not exaggerated.

The first third of the book is necessary historical background which has often been described in print. But even here are valuable touches of original comment. Dr. Tucker notes for instance that neither Buddhism nor Confucianism made a real impression till they adapted themselves to the conceptions and customs native to Japan: and he offers a brief but fair analysis of the complex revulsion against Christianity after its first success in the sixteenth century. His suggested 'fulness of the times' doctrine in missionary history is of interest; and he points ungrudgingly to the revivification of Buddhism through contact with Christian effort as helping to save Japan from the flood of western materialism.

The lectures include notable instances of missionary labours outside those which the title covers, and indeed outside the Anglican communion—no pictures of Japanese Christianity could be drawn otherwise; but notice of the large Roman Catholic missions is hardly proportionate.

The later lectures increasingly include matter of practical concern to present-day missionary policy in Japan, *e.g.* the American policy of not building up native churches in dependence on foreign money, which dates as early as 1883. Again, the unpreparedness of the Western Churches to guide the Church in Japan in facing the industrial and social problems of the last decades leaves the reader thinking. So also does the uncertainty over what is now—not for the first time in history—a burning problem of the hour, the conflict of loyalties when 'divine' attributes are claimed for the Throne. Though not written for that purpose, these pages may illustrate the fact that continual 'problems' are part of the difficulty and interest of missionary life in Japan. The book is well indexed.

Cecil H. Boutflower.

* *The History of the Episcopal Church in Japan.* By the Rt. Rev. H. St. G. Tucker. (Scribner's. 7/6. 1938.)

THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE*

'What is Truth?' asked jesting Pilate and would not stay for an answer. Had he been able to stay for an answer, and had a modern philosopher taken the place of the Prisoner before him, Pilate might have had to wait a very considerable time before the answer was completed. To the modern mind, Truth appears to be of many kinds, metaphysical, scientific, historical, aesthetic, moral, spiritual. There is also absolute Truth and relative Truth, positive Truth and negative Truth: Truth of fact and Truth of value.

Hence to answer truly the child's question when told the story of Eve and the apple: Is it true? is no easy matter. And that because it may be true in one sphere but not in another. Older people ask: Is the Bible true? George Crabbe counted the poor old woman in a rural cottage blessed above many philosophers because 'she knew, and only knew, her Bible true.' Her knowledge of the Bible was vastly less than that which Professor Stanley Cook possesses but yet in its essence the truth which he derives from the Bible is that which she derived from it. For both it contains the secret of salvation—an ideal of life, and a way of living which enables the soul to think thoughts deathless and eternal and brings it into communion with Divine powers which enable it to see life steadily and see it whole and to live it like a moral and spiritual being and not like an immoralist and a materialist.

The Truth of the Bible consists for Dr. Stanley Cook in the soundness of its developing religious and moral ideals and the way in which in the Bible we see those ideals justifying themselves in action whether in the case of individuals or communities. This is happily presented in the following citation:

> 'We have in the Bible, not particular events that happened once and for all, we have instead unique examples of ideas of universal validity which the old Israel had the privilege of carrying out and developing: and if they were "true" then, they cannot be less "true" now' (p. 39).

It is impossible in the case of a book of this character to present a more illuminating and coherent view of it than that which the author himself gives.

> 'Chapter I, on the Inter-dependence of Religion and Research, deals especially with the interpenetration of the two spheres, or hemispheres, of the "religious" and the "non-religious."
>
> 'Chapters II, III and IV . . . are concerned with Old Testament criticism and the way in which the Pentateuch illustrates the Exile Age: the work of the Prophets: the idea of "Righteousness": the post-exilic Israel: and the inter-relation between the changes in the Exilic Age and those in the first century A.D.

* *The Truth of the Bible.* By Professor Stanley A. Cook, F.B.A. (S.P.C.K. 9/-. 1938.)

'Chapter V, on the development or evolution of Religion in and behind the Bible, emphasises the uniqueness of the Book for our knowledge of processes of growth and change, and the necessity of understanding the bifurcation in the first century A.D. into Christianity and Rabbinical Judaism.

'Chapter VI turns to the more philosophical aspects of the changes which took place in and behind the Bible and also of the changes in our interpretation of these: the creative movements in life and thought: the emergence of new stages and the difference between the "before" and "after": and the essential differences between the Biblical and the non-Biblical material and the various ways in which we approach and use it. Knowing, as we do, the influence of the Bible in history, we may also ask ourselves whether the critical study of the Bible will exercise a fresh influence upon theology and philosophy, more in accordance with modern thought.

'Chapter VII (is) on ideas of Holiness and Righteousness. . . . The holy or sacred is not necessarily ethical, and ideas of Righteousness (Rightness), Order and Truth are interconnected. . . .

'Chapter VIII gives a summary account of the period round about the sixth century B.C. The Bible is Levantine (Palestinian) rather than Semitic or Hebrew. . . .

'Chapter IX is an independent essay on Ethical Monotheism and the Theory of Religion. The former forces us to crystallize our religious thoughts and sharpens the difference between the religion of Israel and other religions. The latter integrally associates Man with the Universe or with its God. Deeper thinking reveals the organic connection between Man and Nature, but it also makes men sons of a Divine Father. The unsuspected or unconscious influence of Man's cosmic or his Divine relationship may account for the paradoxes that arise as our thoughts pass from this real external world in which we have to live to the point where one may question whether, in the last analysis, there is really any "external" world.

'The last three chapters carry on and supplement the previous nine. Chapter X is more concerned with historical processes, the way in which the present epoch and the two great epochs in the Bible interpret one another, and the nature of the processes that move history in individuals and peoples. . . . In Chapter XI we find, as we go deeper into the Bible, that philosophical questions arise of Truth, Order, Right and Reality. . . . The dialectic process in history is not so much philosophical or even social-economic as religious: God creating the world and reconciling it to Himself in His Messiah the Christ. Christianity—one may say—arose out of the new consciousness at a certain period in history of a Divine Process which creates, loves it creatures, gives them freedom, and atones and repairs their errors. It was a religious Truth revealed in history, and it may require a new historical event, and a sweeping religious awakening, once more to give it renewed freshness, reality and driving power. . . . But there is an orderly and "natural" development of life and thought, and there can be no "short cuts" to our Promised Land. Between us and the Ultimate Reality there is a veritable hierarchy of processes (physical, organic, psychological and, now, ideological), and through them every creature, according to its stage of development, gains experience, and fulness of life. The words ideology, ideological, and the like have an ugly sound for many of us: but these chapters culminate in the

conviction (*a*) that the "ideological" processes are the "highest" while the physical are the "lowest," (*b*) that all the processes can be mutually illuminative, and (*c*) that the uncertainty and unrest of the present age are due to the fact that we have not yet found the "ideology" that answers to the world-wide awakening of consciousness. But along with this conviction is another: that only some form of Christianity will be able to point the way, and that in so doing it will lead to a yet further development in Man like those in the past' (pp. x—xiii).

The problem of Israel is much in men's minds to-day. The stone which the builders of world history rejected after the rise of the Christian Religion is still a stone of stumbling and rock of offence. Why? Dr. Stanley Cook provides an answer—surely the answer.

> 'Israel could never throw off her extreme self-consciousness: conscious of a religious superiority, she could not learn that self-sacrifice was the price of leadership, and that he who would be first must walk last, and that he who was most conscious of self must lose that self' (p. 39).

It is this self-consciousness which has led Israel to cling to tribalism and traditionalism at the expense of the universal and eternal elements in her religion. When, under the pressure of modern life, the tribalism and traditionalism are exorcised they are replaced in too many cases by a naturalistic materialism and not by those moral and spiritual ideals which constitute the Truth of the Bible.

H.D.A.M.

PASTOR IN PAROCHIA *

When clergymen sign petitions and take part in agitations, they are often enough misguided. But when they talk about their own parishes and their own experiments, they often talk a good deal of sense. *Sunday Morning: the New Way* deals with a liturgical revolution which is taking place in the Church of England. It used to be emphatically said, 'You will never convert England with choral mattins.' To-day Sung Mass at 11 and Sung Mattins come into the same condemnation. In an appendix to this book a high-church clergyman writes to the people of a parish explaining how the bad habit of non-communicating attendance at an 11 a.m. Choral Eucharist arose.

It is being discovered by Catholic and Evangelical alike that a Parish Communion at 9 or 9.30 is the way to deal with the problem of Sunday morning worship. Evidence comes from men of all 'schools' working in country, industrial and suburban parishes, and across the seas.

**Sunday Morning: the New Way.* Edited by Father Edward. (S.P.C.K. 1938. Paper 2/6, cloth 3/6.)

The Christian Answer to the Problem of Evil. By J. S. Whale. (S.C.M. Press. 1936. 2/6.)

Pain and Providence. By Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A. (The Epworth Press. 1935. 3d.)

Verify your References: Studies in Popular Apologetics. By Clement F. Rogers, M.A. (S.P.C.K. 1938. 3/6.)

Almost invariably associated with the Parish Communion is the Parish Breakfast afterwards. This is a remarkable revival of the primitive *Agapé* —save that the *Agapé* seems always to have preceded the Eucharist not to have followed it, in the primitive Church.

Those who have prepared candidates for Confirmation notice how the newly-confirmed young people regard the Holy Communion as their 'own' service. Contributors to this book find that the newly-confirmed can be easily encouraged to come Sunday by Sunday to the Parish Communion. It is not, however, exclusively a youthful service. One gratifying feature is the presence of whole families.

Can the custom of primitive Eucharist *Agapé* be generally revived, seeing that it has been in abeyance for many centuries? Professor Swete warned enthusiasts that 'the lure of primitiveness' may be as deceptive as 'the lure of mediaevalism.' May not the attempt to turn all twentieth-century Christians into sacramentalists be one of the causes of non-attendance at Church?

In his small volume, *The Christian Answer to the Problem of Evil,* the President of Cheshunt, Cambridge, publishes a course of broadcast talks. Wireless lectures are remarkable for learning, conciseness and freedom from syntactical complexity. These are not exceptions.

Dr. Whale believes in a good God. There is therefore for him a Problem of Evil. Why not solve this problem by the simple expedient of abandoning theism?

> 'To this I would reply that even though the problem of evil vanishes if there be no God, such a hypothesis lands you at once with a new problem, even more intractable than the old, namely the problem of good.'

Assuming there *is* a problem of evil, it can be got round in several false ways, *e.g.* evil is an illusion; evil is an element necessary to the perfection of the whole; evil is entirely the work of the devil.

> 'The Christian answer to the problem of evil begins by rejecting all those tempting solutions which would simplify the issue by getting rid of the triangle.'

By 'triangle' is meant those axioms which must never be lost sight of: the first, that God is absolutely sovereign; the second, that God is love; the third, that evil is real. Each false solution of the problem denies one or more of these axioms.

Chapter II is the answer of Theism and Chapter III the specifically Christian answer, the answer of the Cross. In the final chapter the listener has his innings and submits his own difficulties for solution.

More passionate, showing the 'bones' of the argument less, yet hitting each nail exactly on the head, is Leslie D. Weatherhead's threepenny book, *Pain and Providence.* One clergyman keeps a pile of these booklets to give away in particularly distressing cases of bereavement.

Professor Clement Rogers in his book *Verify your References* must be an unwelcome antagonist for any opponent of Christianity to meet. He will not allow the most commonplace statements to pass unexamined. Thus he reads in a newspaper:

> 'The bishops in the House of Lords unanimously opposed every effort to abolish the slave trade in the British Colonies. All bills to increase education and to improve the well-being of the people met with similar opposition. The clergy unanimously denounced Darwin and evolution, chloroform and every attempt to raise the position of women.'

Far from accepting with simple faith this summary of ancient history, Prof. Rogers writes immediately to the editor of the paper and says: *'Every one of these statements is false'* — and proves it up to the hilt.

In his work at 'question time' in Hyde Park, Prof. Rogers has met with the queerest opinions. It appears that the canonical books of the New Testament were selected in this way: at the Council of Nicaea the bishops put under a table all the books that were to be considered; then they prayed, and the genuine ones jumped up on to the table. This fancy can be traced to one man's error made two hundred years ago and propagated since by ignorant lecturers.

But there are also 'people who ought to know better.' They make references, in popular novels and elsewhere, which are remorselessly 'verified' in Chapter V.

A fruitful source of error is the Argument from Silence, which can see no difference between 'says nothing about' and 'knows nothing about.' If Jesus Christ had really existed, there would have been some reference in His sayings to Mount Hermon, the most conspicuous object of the Galilean landscape. But He 'knows nothing' (*i.e.* says nothing) about it. Therefore it is probable that Jesus is 'wholly the invention of priestcraft.'

Prof. Rogers can be entertaining because he is scholarly. He has verified all his own references, and he gives a useful index. And his work opens the parish priest's eyes to the strange underworld which lies beneath his feet.

C. G. CHALLENGER.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PROFESSOR STOCKS*

Miss D. M. Emmet has edited with an instructive introduction various essays by the late J. L. Stocks, formerly Professor of Philosophy at Manchester, and Vice-Chancellor of Liverpool University. He never stated his philosophy as a whole, but we can gather from these essays what it must have been, just as a palaeontologist can reconstruct some monster of prehistoric times from a few fossil bones.

* *Reason and Intuition.* By J. L. Stocks. (Humphrey Milford. 1939. 12/6.)

All philosophy must begin with an analysis of the given: Stocks was almost alone among contemporary philosophers in realizing that it should not end there. Too many modern philosophers are content to analyse and catalogue 'facts' and propositions, like the Babylonian astronomers: Stocks, like the Greek and the modern astronomers, while he did not ride roughshod over facts, was not content with cataloguing them, but tried to harmonize them into a constructive synthetic system. He was an Aristotelian in three distinct senses: he contributed to Aristotelian studies; he made a fruitful and original application of the Aristotelian concept of formal cause; and he tried to see human knowledge as a whole, not as a mass of disjointed specialized fields.

His philosophy of politics — in which, like Plato, he played an active part — was dominated by his illuminating thesis that the will of the individual is the material, and the government the formal, element in a state, just as in a house the bricks roughly represent the matter, or material element, and the plan the form, or formal element, in the Platonic terminology developed by Aristotle and the Schoolmen. Stocks' thesis is not factual but methodological; he has discovered not a new fact, but a new way of regarding old facts. He accuses Marx and others of disregarding the formal element and says: 'There is always a formative principle of a higher order at work.' He also says that democracy presupposes the fundamental goodness of the individual. These statements accord with the beliefs of most Modernists, who deny all doctrines of total depravity and assert the immanent activity of God in the evolutionary processes. Stocks, by these clear analyses of politics, has made it easier to grasp certain relations between politics and theology.

The most important of his useful suggestions in Religious Philosophy is the distinction, first made in his earlier work, *The Limits of Purpose*, between desire, which is for the generic, and affection, which is for the individual. Our regard for a loaf of bread is desire; and, if we lose one loaf, another will do equally well: our regard for a child is affection; and, if we lose a child, another can never quite take its place. God's love is in this sense affection. This suggestion provides a basis for the doctrines of immortality and universalism.

This is a technical work on philosophy which is so sane, lucid and valuable that even those who are not students of philosophy will lose much by not reading it.

D. E. H. Whiteley.

THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS*

We have before us specimens of two series of commentaries for schools, *Romans* in the Clarendon Bible (Prof. Kirk) and *St. Matthew* in the School

* *Epistle to the Romans* (The Clarendon Bible). By K. E. Kirk. 1937. 4/6. *St. Matthew* (The School Clarendon Bible). By B. K. Rattey. 1938. 2/6. Both published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Clarendon Bible (Miss Rattey). The aims and methods of writing school books on Divinity have seen a great change in recent years, as these commentaries testify. The old idea was to have nothing in a school text-book that could shock the parents of the children. This involved the omission of any results of critical research work more recent than, say, thirty years. The end was sometimes attained by not choosing first-rate scholars as the authors; but when scholars undertook the work they were obliged to curb themselves severely. The time is now past when intelligent teachers can be content with thoroughly out of date books. The two series, of which we have specimens, are intended to meet the needs of two distinct grades: the School Clarendon Bible is suitable for middle forms of schools up to school certificate standard; the Clarendon Bible is for the sixth form, and is equally suitable as a not too detailed study for adults. Dr. Kirk's commentary in the latter series well fulfils its object. It is up to date. It presents, for instance, the new evidence of the Beatty-Michigan papyrus on the question of various recensions of the epistle. The difficult theological problems raised by *Romans* are dealt with in a way which would convince any reader that St. Paul was a master of deep thought applicable to the present day, and that he was not a purveyor either of legal quibbles or of magical spells. The *Epistle to the Romans* is not one to be studied without a good deal of effort; but, provided the student is keen enough to work through it, he will find a clear guide in this commentary. The problem how to present his material is far more difficult for a writer in the School Clarendon Bible, for, in writing for younger people, he has to keep them in mind all the time. Fifth form boys and girls are not often able to form a really independent judgment: their teacher or text-book author must take the responsibility of telling them what to believe. That belief must include the foundations on which spiritual life can be built. It must not include statements which are known by scholars to be false. Many a man's faith has been wrecked because he was taught to regard as fundamental to the faith the erroneous preconceptions of a former generation. No one could really suppose that a belief in the accuracy of our Lord's genealogy was of value in establishing our faith in Him. Miss Rattey simply says that it is artificial in structure. One has to remember that it is older people, and not children, who are shocked to learn that the Gospels are not entirely the work of the men whose names they bear, and Miss Rattey has not feared to give a short introduction to the synoptic problem, including Proto-Luke. The story of the request of the Chief Priests and Pharisees to Pilate for a guard over the sepulchre would strike even an intelligent child as peculiar; and the statement that it is unhistorical, together with its sequel, the story of how the stone was rolled away, will help rather than hinder most children. With regard to the resurrection itself the position is different. Our faith depends on the resurrection. Miss Rattey is perfectly right in saying that the Gospels all agree that the tomb was empty,

and that Jesus was seen alive, and in drawing attention to the New Testament witness to the changed lives of the Apostles as a result of their belief in the resurrection. That some have doubted the empty tomb, and that others have tried to explain it away, raise problems with which children need not be disturbed till they are older. Miss Rattey wisely refrains from raising such problems. It is clear that in a commentary such as this, the decision has to be made on almost every page what to say and what to leave unsaid, and the decision to be valid must be not merely that of the scholar but of the teacher who understands the child's mind. Both the volumes before us have the Revised Version printed in full, and are provided with introduction and commentary. In the larger book reference is made when necessary to the Greek words of the text. Both books are fully illustrated, twenty-two in *Romans* and eight in *St. Matthew,* and in both cases the pictures have been chosen as real illustrations of the subject-matter, and for the most part the sort of illustrations that will be quite new to the readers. In times past the Divinity teaching in secondary schools was almost invariably done by non-specialists. The fact that such books as these are called for raises the hope that in future Divinity will be entrusted to men and women who have taken honours degrees in it, just as much as in the case of Mathematics, Science or Geography.

L. E. Browne.

THE LAST OF THE ANGLO-SAXON SAINTS

In the ancient parish church of Overbury, Worcestershire, stands a curious font. On its twelfth century chalice-shaped bowl are two roughly carved figures, one of a priest with a model of a building in his right hand; the other, a bishop, with a pastoral staff in each hand. The conjecture is probably sound that the priest is the builder of the church, and the bishop is St. Wulstan, its consecrator. Wulstan possessed two bishoprics, Worcester and Chester. He began life when the Danes were dominant in England. He died when the Normans were firmly established in our land. He died in 1095, having lived 87 years. Canute, Edward the Confessor, Harold, William the Conqueror and William Rufus were among his sovereigns. An Anglo-Saxon record of his life was made by his familiar Coleman. This was compressed and translated by the famous monastic chronicler, William of Malmsbury. In 1934 this little volume was translated into polished English by Archdeacon Peile.*

Wulstan was sprung from an ancient Mercian family. When quite young he became a monk and entered the monastery of Worcester where he was successively schoolmaster, precentor, sacristan, and prior. Some thirty-five years before his death he was invested as Bishop of Worcester and Chester by Edward the Confessor.

* *William of Malmsbury's Life of St. Wulstan,* now rendered into English by J. H. F. Peile, Archdeacon of Worcester. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford.)

Very early Wulstan became famous for his piety, and he well deserved the reputation. He was whole-heartedly good and his goodness shewed itself in large-hearted generosity to his fellow-men in his ability both to give and forgive. As a monk he was noted for his asceticism and eloquent sermons. As a bishop, for his extraordinary energy, organising power, apostolic zeal and unspoilt simplicity of life and manners. Like the ecclesiastics of his age he was a great Church builder. Miracles of many kinds were attributed to him — some no doubt were simply coincidences, as when one of his masons fell forty feet to the ground and was unhurt. Other miracles were undoubtedly due to the spirit of faith which he created in his adherents by his almost superhuman goodness: others were the product of superstitious fears and hallucinations. His sainthood, however, will seem to readers of hagiology to be of the normal English type — sincere, simple, social, practical, rigorously self-disciplined and thoroughly loveable.

Wulstan's life, however, possesses many points of interest for the archaeologist and Church historian. For instance, it is noted that there were no stone altars in England before the tenth century. English altars were always of wood — hence the name God's Board. Stone altars came in from the Continent, and were abolished at the Reformation when the English Church returned to its primitive usage. This has a bearing on the recent dispute at St. Hilary's in Cornwall. Altars were apparently very numerous at this time in great churches. There were eighteen in the old cathedral of Worcester and Wulstan daily offered up devotions before each of them.

Compared with modern episcopal establishments, that of Wulstan was enormous. He had a body of resident clerks and priests: many young nobles waited on him at table. William the Conqueror required the Bishop to maintain a large body of knights as a protection against a possible Danish invasion. These men lived with the Bishop. Bishops were plainly expected to do their patriotic duty in those benighted times. It is a tribute to the solid Christian virtue and good sense of Wulstan that he was equally loved and trusted by sovereigns as different as Harold the Saxon, Edward the Confessor and William the Conqueror. The Bishop's revenues were large but were strained to the uttermost by his liberal hospitality.

It is noted of Wulstan that he did his best to abolish the custom of baptismal fees and would never take any. He had a great dislike to men wearing their hair long. He regarded the custom as effeminate and with a little penknife would playfully cut off one of their locks, hoping that the owner would follow his example in the case of the rest of them.

Wulstan's life sheds new light on the church life in England in this period. The cultus at this period in England was not primitive but mediaeval: it included the Virgin and the saints: masses were said for the dead: the bones of the saints were preserved as relics. The Church of

this period was strongly national: the kings invested the bishops and the bishops themselves took an important part in the councils of the State. The Pope's power was great, but as a religious rather than a political influence.

When Wulstan refuses to accept the See of Worcester he is persuaded to yield when told that it is the Pope's wish and that he must not disobey him. The monastic clergy are held in much greater esteem than the secular clergy and exercise a much greater influence. Perhaps the least attractive aspect of Wulstan's life is his harsh treatment of the married clergy. William of Malmsbury writes:

> 'Wedded priests he brought under one edict, commanding them to renounce their fleshly desires or their churches. If they loved chastity, they might remain and be welcome: if they were the servants of bodily pleasures, they must go forth in disgrace. Some there were who chose rather to go without their churches than their women: and of these some wandered about till they starved: others sought and at last found some other provision. A few, taking the wiser way, honourably grew old in their benefices. The Bishop, to avoid scandal, would not thereafter ordain to the priesthood any who was not sworn to celibacy' (p. 81).

When King John died, regarded by many as an atheist, he took precautions against the future by charging that his body should be laid beside that of St. Wulstan in Worcester Cathedral.

A painful sidelight is shed on the social history of the times by the charge made against the merchants of Bristol that they sold their own countrymen, particularly women and children, into slavery in Ireland.

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

EVANGELISM AND THE FILM.

SIR,

Mr. Maxfield's short article on 'Evangelism and the Film' gives rise to certain queries, which I should like to put to him through your correspondence columns, as they appear to me to be of general interest.

First, there are still some cities and towns, of which the city of Bradford is one, where cinemas are not normally opened on Sundays. Eventually, I suppose, Sunday opening will be universal. Until that is so in any particular place, is it expedient for the churches to use the film for Sunday worship, thus giving an opening to those who desire the opening of Sunday cinemas to press for them once again? My view is that the Sunday opening of cinemas should be deferred in any area as long as possible, as it inevitably ties up several employees who would otherwise have a holiday, and it is just one more temptation to the many among our worshippers

who are hovering between coming and not coming to church to choose the latter course. This question will not arise where Sunday opening of cinemas is general, but it certainly does arise here at present.

Secondly, the question of finance at once pops its head up. Presumably, a projector must be purchased by the church, and it is not easy to convince the average Church Council that such expenditure is justified. Added to this, the continual expense involved in the hiring of films has to be considered. Further, as the film would normally be used as part of, or following, an ordinary service, where is it suggested that the projector shall be placed? Is it to be in or near the sanctuary, to be placed in position when the moment arrives, and worked from behind the screen? Or is it to be in what is usually an awkward position somewhere in the centre aisle?

It is because Mr. Maxfield is trying to help in the solution of a problem which, to a greater or lesser degree, confronts all Incumbents, that I have raised these points; with his experience, I feel sure he will be able to throw some light upon them.

DONALD A. FOSTER.

St. Stephen's Vicarage, 106 Birch Lane, Bradford.

April 22nd, 1939.

CIVILISATION AND THE CHRISTIAN METAPHYSIC.

SIR,

The letter of A. M. Fairweather raises the vital question, 'How do we know God's Will adequately . . .?' It is, he says, 'a challenge that must be faced,' and with this I heartily agree. The fact that I do not pretend to understand the writer's answer to it (nor indeed most of the many answers which have been put forward by Christian philosophers) may indicate the limited extent of my spiritual and/or mental development; but it also proves conclusively to me that the same answers are unintelligible to vast numbers of people who give such questions less attention than I do. And yet it seems to me that there exists an answer to this 'challenge' which is quite simple and intelligible, forming in itself the basis of a comprehensive theology and implying a practical ethic thoroughly in harmony with the Christian 'law of love.' This answer is simply that God's Will has no limits; that He is, in the words of Spinoza, 'the effective cause of all that is.' Many churchmen, including Modernists, seem to regard such a belief with something akin to horror. Yet, apart from its being implied in the first clause of the Creed, it appears to have been explicitly held by Wycliffe, and certainly by Archbishop Bradwardine before him. Moreover, though usually expressed in obscure or emotional language, such a position seems to have been the credal summit towards which the mystic of all ages has been inevitably led.

I have been told that such a belief is 'subversive of Christian morality because it makes God responsible for the sinful deeds of men.' Such an objection betrays an anthropomorphic outlook which those who have come to conceive God as the cause of all being cannot easily reassume. Still, admitting the statement in all its inadequacy, if we can see God as 'responsible' for 'sin,' are we not thereby enabled to treat the 'sinner' with more of the spirit of Him Who said, 'I am not come to judge the world but to save the world,' and Who revealed to man a God Who, by sending the rain and the sun upon the just and the unjust, manifestly transcends all our conceptions of moral praise and blame?

Such, at any rate, was the opinion of Mr. Fairweather's countryman, the famous seventeenth century divine, Thomas Boston, whose volume of sermons entitled *The Crook in the Lot* was once, and still deserves to be, widely read. For Boston the practice of the Christian virtues depended not upon any attempt to define the Will of God, but simply and logically upon accepting the world as it is as God's Will. His method was to attain 'a Christian deportment under afflicting incidents' by 'a wise eyeing of the hand of God in all we find to bear hard upon us,' whether 'directly' or 'mediately from the hand of the creature.'

But the nearest secular analogy to this religious position is to be found in the modern 'scientific attitude' which is effecting such marked results in the social services and, to a less degree, the administration of the law—results which few will deny to be in harmony with Christian ideals. This scientific attitude is admittedly based upon a causality of nature rather than of God. The 'sinner' is regarded as the product of nature and nurture, of hereditary defects, abnormal glandular secretions, etc. This means that he is not *blamed* for being what he is, and so the task of the social administrator has become not to 'judge' but to 'save.' If this change of outlook is made possible by a 'wise eyeing' of the hand of nature rather than of God in 'all that we find to bear hard upon us,' there is nevertheless no reason why the Theist should not make the further step and, looking 'through nature up to nature's God,' change his outlook in the same way.

Finally, it must not be overlooked (as Boston undoubtedly did) that to regard God's Will or causality as universal in scope means that we must include *ourselves* within its ambit, and so achieve the consciousness of union with Him which is the goal of all personal religion. This does not involve the error of antinomianism of libertinism, for the dictates of the educated conscience will be regarded as no less God-caused than the past which evokes them. Unlike Spinoza here, we cannot explain away 'remorse,' except only that remorse which arises from the conviction that we have opposed the Will of God.

If such a belief as I have outlined here seems untenable to some, the present state of doctrine is even less tolerable. I believe the late F. C. S. Schiller once said that there was only one thing lacking in Kant's moral philosophy. He told us that we ought to do our duty, but omitted to tell us what that duty was. Substitute 'God's will' for 'duty' and the same criticism applies to our case. I have heard, for instance, one clergyman try to console bereaved parents for the loss of a child by insisting that they must not think of it as God's Will. Another, supported by the Prayer Book, affirms that 'the Lord hath given, and the Lord hath taken away.' And in almost any local paper one may read reports of sermons at times of crisis in which other nations are (*a*) condemned as opposing God's Will, or (*b*) referred to as 'instruments of God' for the working of His judgment upon our own nation, which has 'disregarded His Will.' Such a paradoxical position at the heart of things cannot surely much longer be ignored by the Church as a whole, much less by those who are the declared opponents of obscurantism — the Modernists.

EDWIN V. MILNER.

School House, Brayton, nr. Selby, Yorkshire.

April 22nd, 1939.